An Era of Growth and Disunion
1825–1877

Television News Broadcast
As you read Unit 3, choose an event that you can present in a television news broadcast. Compile a list of information for a script. Make a list of the visual images that you will use to illustrate your report. Present your news report to the class.

The Battle of Fredericksburg, December 13, 1862 by Carl Rochling
CHAPTER 9

EXPANDING MARKETS AND MOVING WEST

**Essential Question**
What were the causes and consequences of westward expansion?

**What You Will Learn**
In this chapter you will learn how westward expansion led to conflict and redefined the nation’s borders.

**SECTION 1: The Market Revolution**
Main Idea Technological changes created greater interaction and more economic diversity among the regions of the nation.

**SECTION 2: Manifest Destiny**
Main Idea Americans moved west, energized by their belief in the rightful expansion of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

**SECTION 3: Expansion in Texas**
Main Idea Mexico offered land grants to American settlers, but conflict developed over religion and other cultural differences, and the issue of slavery.

**SECTION 4: The War with Mexico**
Main Idea Tensions over the U.S. annexation of Texas led to war with Mexico, resulting in huge territorial gains for the United States.

William Ranney’s 1853 painting *Advice on the Prairie* is an理想istic image of a family traveling west in the mid-1800s.

USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>The Erie Canal connects the East to the West.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Andrew Jackson is elected president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Joseph Smith establishes the Mormon Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Chief Black Hawk leads Sauk rebellion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Martin Van Buren is elected president.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WORLD

| 1826 | Uruguay becomes an independent republic. |
| 1828 | Revolutions occur in Belgium, France, and Poland. |
| 1833 | Santa Anna is elected president of Mexico. |
| 1835 | Ferdinand I becomes emperor of Austria. |
In the 1820s and 1830s the country was energized by new inventions and new business. Now it is 1840, and an economic downturn dampens the hopes of workers and business owners alike. Newspaper ads urge Americans to pack up and move west. But many people and nations already inhabit the North American West. Mexico owns a large part of the area, and Native Americans have been living there for centuries.

Explore the Issues
- What are some reasons countries expand their borders?
- What might be benefits or drawbacks of expansion?
The Market Revolution

### Main Idea

Technological changes created greater interaction and more economic diversity among the regions of the nation.

### Why It Matters Now

The linking of markets continues today, as new technologies are opening the United States to globalized trade.

### Terms & Names

- Samuel F. B. Morse
- specialization
- market revolution
- capitalism
- entrepreneur
- telegraph
- John Deere
- Cyrus McCormick

### One American's Story

In 1837, painter and scientist **Samuel F. B. Morse**, with Leonard Gale, built an electromagnetic telegraph. Morse's first model could send signals ten miles through copper wire. Morse asked Congress to fund an experimental telegraphic communication that would travel for 100 miles.

**A Personal Voice**  
**Samuel F. B. Morse**

"This mode of instantaneous communication must inevitably become an instrument of immense power, to be wielded for good or for evil. ... Let the sole right of using the Telegraph belong, in the first place, to the Government, who should grant ... the right to lay down a communication between any two points for the purpose of transmitting intelligence."

—quoted in *Samuel F. B. Morse: His Letters and Journals*

Congress granted Morse $30,000 to build a 40-mile telegraph line between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. In 1844, Morse tapped out in code the words "What hath God wrought?" The message sped from Washington, D.C., over a metal wire in less than a second. As new communication links began to put people into instant communication with one another, new transportation links carried goods and people across vast regions.

### U.S. Markets Expand

In the early 19th century, rural American workers produced their own goods or traded with neighbors to meet almost all of their needs. Farm families were self-sufficient—they grew crops and raised animals for food and made their own clothing, candles, and soap. At local markets, farmers sold wood, eggs, or butter for cash, which they used to purchase the coffee, tea, sugar, or horseshoes they couldn’t produce themselves.

By midcentury, however, the United States had become more industrialized, especially in the Northeast, where the rise of textile mills and the factory system changed the lives of workers and consumers. Now, workers spent their earnings...
on goods produced by other workers. Farmers began to shift from self-sufficiency to specialization, raising one or two cash crops that they could sell at home or abroad.

These developments led to a market revolution, in which people bought and sold goods rather than making them for their own use. The market revolution created a striking change in the U.S. economy and in the daily lives of Americans. In these decades, goods and services multiplied while incomes rose. In fact, in the 1840s, the national economy grew more than it had in the previous 40 years.

THE ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT The quickening pace of U.S. economic growth depended on capitalism, the economic system in which private businesses and individuals control the means of production—such as factories, machines, and land—and use them to earn profits. For example, in 1813, Francis Cabot Lowell and other Boston merchants had put up $400,000 to form the Boston Manufacturing Company, which produced textiles. Other businesspeople supplied their own funds to create capital—the money, property, machines, and factories that fueled America’s expanding economy.

These investors, called entrepreneurs from a French word that means “to undertake,” risked their own money in new industries. They risked losing their investment, but they also stood to earn huge profits if they succeeded. Alexander Mackay, a Scottish journalist who lived in Canada and traveled in the United States, applauded the entrepreneurs’ competitive spirit.

A PERSONAL VOICE ALEXANDER MACKAY

“America is a country in which fortunes have yet to be made. . . . All cannot be made wealthy, but all have a chance of securing a prize. This stimulates to the race, and hence the eagerness of the competition.”

—quoted in The Western World

NEW INVENTIONS Inventor-entrepreneurs began to develop goods to make life more comfortable for more people. For example, Charles Goodyear developed vulcanized rubber in 1839. Unlike untreated India rubber, the new product didn’t freeze in cold weather or melt in hot weather. People first used the product to protect their boots, but, in the early 1900s, it became indispensable in the manufacturing of automobile tires.

A natural place for the growth of industrialization was in producing clothing, a process greatly aided by the invention of the sewing machine. Patented by Elias Howe in 1846, the sewing machine found its first use in shoe factories. Homemakers appreciated I. M. Singer’s addition of the foot treadle, which drastically reduced the time it took to sew garments. More importantly,
the foot-treadle sewing machine led to the factory production of clothing. When clothing prices tumbled by more than 75 percent, increasing numbers of working people could afford to buy store-bought clothes.

**IMPACT ON HOUSEHOLD ECONOMY** While entrepreneurial activity boosted America’s industrial output, American agriculture continued to flourish. Workers in industrial cities needed food. To meet this demand, American farmers began to use mechanized farm equipment produced in factories. Farmers, therefore, made significant contributions to the American industrial machine and became important consumers of manufactured items.

Manufactured items grew less expensive as technology advances lowered expenses. For example, a clock that had cost $50 to craft by hand in 1800 could be turned out by machine for half a dollar by midcentury. Falling prices meant that many workers became regular consumers. They purchased new products not only for work, but for comfort as well.

**The Economic Revolution**

These new inventions, many developed in the United States, contributed immensely to changes in American life. Some inventions simply made life more enjoyable. Other inventions fueled the economic revolution of the midcentury, and transformed manufacturing, transportation and communication.

**IMPACT ON COMMUNICATION** Improving on a device developed by Joseph Henry, Samuel F. B. Morse, a New England artist, created the **telegraph** in 1837 to carry messages, tapped in code, across copper wire. Within ten years, telegraph lines connected the larger cities on the East Coast.

Businesses used the new communication device to transmit orders and to relay up-to-date information on
prices and sales. The telegraph was a huge success. The new railroads employed the telegraph to keep trains moving regularly and to warn engineers of safety hazards. By 1854, 23,000 miles of telegraph wire crossed the country.

**IMPACT ON TRANSPORTATION** Better and faster transportation became essential to the expansion of agriculture and industry. Farmers and manufacturers alike sought more direct ways to ship their goods to market. In 1807, Pennsylvanian Robert Fulton had ushered in the steamboat era when his boat, the Clermont, made the 150-mile trip up the Hudson River from New York City to Albany, New York, in 32 hours. Ships that had previously only been able to drift southward down the Mississippi with the current could now turn around to make the return trip because they were powered by steam engines. By 1830, 200 steamboats traveled the nation’s western rivers, thus slashing freight rates as well as voyage times.

Water transport was particularly important in moving heavy machinery and such raw materials as lead and copper. Where waterways didn’t exist, workers excavated them. In 1816, America had a mere 100 miles of canals. Twenty-five years later, the country boasted more than 3,300 miles of canals.

The Erie Canal was the nation’s first major canal, and it was used heavily. Shipping charges fell to about a tenth of the cost of sending goods over land. Before the first shovel broke ground on the Erie Canal in 1817, for example, freight charges between Buffalo, New York, and New York City averaged 19 cents a ton per mile. By 1830, that average had fallen to less than 2 cents.

The Erie Canal’s success led to dozens of other canal projects. Farmers in Ohio no longer depended on Mississippi River passage to New Orleans. They could now ship their grain via canal and river to New York City, the nation’s major port. The canals also opened the heartland of America to world markets by connecting the Northeast to the Midwest.

**EMERGENCE OF RAILROADS** The heyday of the canals lasted only until the 1860s, due to the rapid emergence of railroads. Although shipping by rail cost significantly more in the 1840s than did shipping by canal, railroads offered the advantage of speed. In addition, trains could operate in the winter, and they brought goods to people who lived inland.

---

**TELEVISION** In the late 1800s, scientists begin to experiment with transmitting pictures as well as words through the air. In 1923, Vladimir Zworykin, a Russian-born American scientist, files a patent for the iconoscope, the first television camera tube suitable for broadcasting. In 1924 he files a patent for the kinescope, the picture tube used in receiving television signals. In 1929, Zworykin demonstrated his new television.

**COMPUTERS** Scientists develop electronically powered computers during the 1940s. In 1951, UNIVAC I (UNIVERSal Automatic Computer) becomes the first commercially available computer. In 1964, IBM initiates System/360, a family of mutually compatible computers that allow several terminals to be attached to one computer system.

**INTERNET** Today, on the Internet, through e-mail (electronic mail) or online conversation, any two people can have instant dialogue. The Internet becomes the modern tool for instant global communication not only of words, but images, too.
By the 1840s, steam engines pulled freight at ten miles an hour—more than four times faster than canal boats traveled. Passengers found such speeds exciting, although early train travel was far from comfortable, as Samuel Breck, a Philadelphia merchant, complained.

A PERSONAL VOICE  SAMUEL BRECK

“If one could stop when one wanted, and if one were not locked up in a box with 50 or 60 tobacco-chewers; and the engine and fire did not burn holes in one’s clothes . . . and the smell of the smoke, of the oil, and of the chimney did not poison one . . . and [one] were not in danger of being blown sky-high or knocked off the rails—it would be the perfection of travelling.”

—quoted in American Railroads

Eventually, railroads grew to be both safe and reliable, and the cost of rail freight gradually came down. By 1850, almost 10,000 miles of track had been laid, and by 1859, railroads carried 2 billion tons of freight a year. C

New Markets Link Regions

By the 1840s, improved transportation and communication made America’s regions interdependent. Arteries like the National Road, whose construction began in 1811, had also opened up western travel. By 1818, the road extended from Cumberland, Maryland, west to Wheeling, Virginia; by 1838, it reached as far west as Springfield, Illinois.

Growing links between America’s regions contributed to the development of regional specialties. The South exported its cotton to England as well as to New England. The West’s grain and livestock fed hungry factory workers in eastern cities and in Europe. The East manufactured textiles and machinery.

SOUTHERN AGRICULTURE Most of the South remained agricultural and relied on such crops as cotton, tobacco, and rice. Southerners who had seen the North’s “filthy, overcrowded, licentious factories” looked with disfavor on industrialization. Even if wealthy Southerners wanted to build factories, they usually lacked the capital to do so because their money was tied up in land and the slaves required to plant and harvest the crops.

Though the new transportation and communication lines were less advanced in the South, these improvements helped keep Americans from every region in touch with one another. Furthermore, they changed the economic relationships between the regions, creating new markets and interdependencies.

NORTHEAST SHIPPING AND MANUFACTURING Heavy investment in canals and railroads transformed the Northeast into the center of American commerce. After the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825, New York City became the central link between American agriculture and European markets. In fact, more cotton was exported through New York City than through any other American city.

The most striking development of the era, however, was the rise in manufacturing. Although most Americans still lived in rural areas and only 14 percent of workers had manufacturing jobs, these workers produced more and better goods at lower prices than had ever been produced before. D
MIDWEST FARMING
As the Northeast began to industrialize, many people moved to farm the fertile soil of the Midwest. First, however, they had to work very hard to make the land arable, or fit to cultivate. Many wooded areas had to be cleared before fields could be planted. Then two ingenious inventions allowed farmers to develop the farmland more efficiently and cheaply, and made farming more profitable. In 1837, blacksmith John Deere invented the first steel plow. It sliced through heavy soil much more easily than existing plows and therefore took less animal power to pull. Deere’s steel plow enabled farmers to replace their oxen with horses.

Once harvest time arrived, the mechanical reaper, invented by Cyrus McCormick, permitted one farmer to do the work of five hired hands. The reaper was packed in parts and shipped to the farmer, along with a handbook of directions for assembling and operating. Armed with plows and reapers, ambitious farmers could shift from subsistence farming to growing such cash crops as wheat and corn.

Meanwhile, the rapid changes encouraged Southerners as well as Northerners to seek land in the seemingly limitless West.
Americans moved west, energized by their belief in the rightful expansion of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The South and Southwest are now the fastest-growing regions of the United States.

**Main Idea**

**Why It Matters Now**

**Terms & Names**

- manifest destiny
- Treaty of Fort Laramie
- Santa Fe Trail
- Oregon Trail
- Mormons
- Joseph Smith
- Brigham Young
- “Fifty-Four Forty or Fight!”

**One American’s Story**

Amelia Stewart Knight’s diary of her family’s five-month journey to Oregon in 1853 described “the beautiful Boise River, with her green timber,” which delighted the family. The last entry in the diary describes when she and her family reached their destination, Oregon.

*—quoted in Covered Wagon Women*

Knight’s situation was by no means unique; probably one in five women who made the trek was pregnant. Her condition, however, did little to lighten her workload. Even young children shouldered important responsibilities on the trail.

**The Frontier Draws Settlers**

Many Americans assumed that the United States would extend its dominion to the Pacific Ocean and create a vast republic that would spread the blessings of democracy and civilization across the continent.

**American Mission** Thomas Jefferson had dreamed that the United States would become an “empire for liberty” by expanding across the continent “with room enough for our descendants to the thousandth and thousandth generation.”

Toward that end, Jefferson’s Louisiana Purchase in 1803 had doubled the young nation’s size. For a quarter century after the War of 1812, Americans explored this huge territory in limited numbers. Then, in the 1840s, expansion fever gripped the country. Americans began to believe that their movement westward and southward was destined and ordained by God.
The editor of the United States Magazine and Democratic Review described the annexation of Texas in 1845 as “the fulfillment of our manifest destiny to over-spread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions.” Many Americans immediately seized on the phrase “manifest destiny” to express their belief that the United States’ destiny was to expand to the Pacific Ocean and into Mexican territory. They believed that this destiny was manifest, or obvious.

**ATTITUDES TOWARD THE FRONTIER** Most Americans had practical reasons for moving west. Many settlers endured the trek because of personal economic problems. The panic of 1837, for example, had dire consequences and convinced many people that they would be better off attempting a fresh start in the West.

The abundance of land in the West was the greatest attraction. Whether for farming or speculation, land ownership was an important step toward prosperity. As farmers and miners moved west, merchants followed, seeking new markets.

While Americans had always traded with Europe, the transportation revolution increased opportunities for trade with Asia as well. Several harbors in the Oregon Territory helped expand trade with China and Japan and also served as naval stations for a Pacific fleet.

**Settlers and Native Americans**

The increasing number of U.S. settlers moving west inevitably affected Native American communities. Most Native Americans tried to maintain strong cultural traditions, even if forced to move from ancestral lands. Some began to assimilate—or become part of—the advancing white culture. Still others, although relatively few in number, fought hard to keep whites away from their homes.

**THE BLACK HAWK WAR** In the early 1830s, white settlers in western Illinois and eastern Iowa placed great pressure on the Native American people there to move west of the Mississippi River. Consequently, representatives from several Native American tribes visited Chief Black Hawk of the Sauk tribe, and one told of a prophet who had a vision of future events involving Black Hawk.

*---tribal elder quoted in* Native American Testimony*

The story convinced Black Hawk to lead a rebellion against the United States. The Black Hawk War started in Illinois and spread to the Wisconsin Territory. It ended in August 1832, when Illinois militia members slaughtered more than 200 Sauk and Fox people. As a result, the Sauk and Fox tribes were forcibly removed to areas west of the Mississippi.
The place that neither the Native Americans nor the settlers dominated, according to historian Richard White, was the middle ground. As long as settlers needed Native Americans as trading partners and guides, relations between settlers and Native Americans could be beneficial. Amelia Stewart Knight described such an encounter on the middle ground.

*A Personal Voice  Amelia Stewart Knight*

“Traveled 13 miles, over very bad roads, without water. After looking in vain for water, we were about to give up as it was near night, when husband came across a company of friendly Cayuse Indians about to camp, who showed him where to find water. . . . We bought a few potatoes from an Indian, which will be a treat for our supper.”

—quoted in *Covered Wagon Women*

By the 1840s, the middle ground was well west of the Mississippi, because the Indian Removal Act of 1830 and other Indian removal treaties had pushed Native Americans off their eastern lands to make room for the settlers.

**Fort Laramie Treaty** As settlers moved west, small numbers of displaced Native Americans occasionally fought them. The U.S. government responded to the settlers’ fears of attack by calling a conference near what is now Laramie, Wyoming. The Cheyenne, Arapaho, Sioux, Crow, and others joined U.S. representatives in swearing “to maintain good faith and friendship in all their mutual intercourse, and to make an effective and lasting peace.”

The 1851 *Treaty of Fort Laramie* provided various Native American nations control of the Central Plains, land east of the Rocky Mountains that stretched roughly from the Arkansas River north to Canada. In turn, these Native Americans promised not to attack settlers and to allow the construction of government forts and roads. The government pledged to honor the agreed-upon boundaries and to make annual payments to the Native Americans.

Still the movement of settlers increased. Traditional Native American hunting lands were trampled and depleted of buffalo and elk. The U.S. government repeatedly violated the terms of the treaty. Subsequent treaties demanded that Native Americans abandon their lands and move to reservations.

**Trails West**

While the westward movement of many U.S. settlers had disastrous effects on the Native American communities there, the experience was also somewhat perilous for traders and settlers. Nevertheless, thousands made the trek, using a series of old Native American trails and new routes.

**The Santa Fe Trail** One of the busiest and most well-known avenues of trade was the **Santa Fe Trail**, which led 780 miles from Independence, Missouri, to Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Each spring between 1821 and the 1860s, Missouri traders loaded their covered wagons with cloth, knives, and guns, and set off toward Santa Fe. For about the first 150 miles—to Council Grove, Kansas—wagons traveled alone. After that, fearing attacks by Kiowa and Comanche, among others, the traders banded into
American Trails West, 1860

The interior of a covered wagon may have looked like this on its way west.

GEOGRAPHY SKILLBUILDER

1. **Location** Approximately how long was the trail from St. Louis to El Paso?

2. **Movement** At a wagon train speed of about 15 miles a day, about how long would that trip take?

A Navajo man and woman in photographs taken by Edward S. Curtis
Conestoga wagons were usually pulled by six horses. These wagons were capable of hauling loads up to six tons.

organized groups of up to 100 wagons. Scouts rode along the column to check for danger. At night the traders formed the wagons into squares with their wheels interlocked, forming a corral for horses, mules, and oxen.

Teamwork ended when Santa Fe came into view. Traders charged off on their own as each tried to be the first to enter the Mexican province of New Mexico. After a few days of trading, they loaded their wagons with silver, gold, and furs, and headed back to the United States. These traders established the first visible American presence in New Mexico and in the Mexican province of Arizona.

**THE OREGON TRAIL** In 1836, Marcus and Narcissa Whitman, Methodist missionaries, made their way into Oregon Territory where they set up mission schools to convert Native Americans to Christianity and educate them. By driving their wagon as far as Fort Boise, they proved that wagons could travel on the Oregon Trail, which started in Independence, Missouri, and ended in Portland, Oregon, in the Willamette Valley. Their letters east praising the fertile soil and abundant rainfall attracted hundreds of other Americans to the Oregon Trail. The route from Independence to Portland traced some of the same paths that Lewis and Clark had followed several decades earlier.

Following the Whitmans’ lead, some of the Oregon pioneers bought wooden-wheeled covered Conestoga wagons. But most walked, pushing handcarts loaded with a few precious possessions. The trip took months. Fever, diarrhea, and cholera killed many travelers, who were then buried alongside the trail.

Caravans provided protection against possible attack by Native Americans. They also helped combat the loneliness of the difficult journey, as Catherine Haun, who migrated from Iowa, explained.

"Eastward I go only by force, but westward I go free."
HENRY DAVID THOREAU

By 1844, about 5,000 American settlers had arrived in Oregon and were farming its green and fertile Willamette Valley.

**THE MORMON MIGRATION** One group that migrated westward along the Oregon Trail consisted of the Mormons, a religious community that would play a major role in the settling of the West. Mormon history began in western New York in 1827 when Joseph Smith and five associates established the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Fayette, New York, in 1830.

Smith and a growing band of followers decided to move west. They settled in Nauvoo, Illinois, in 1839. Within five years, the community numbered 20,000. When Smith’s angry neighbors printed protests against polygamy, the Mormons’
practice of having more than one wife, Smith destroyed their printing press. As a result, in 1844 he was jailed for treason. An anti-Mormon mob broke into the jail and murdered Smith and his brother.

Smith’s successor, Brigham Young, decided to move his followers beyond the boundaries of the United States. Thousands of Mormons travelled by wagon north to Nebraska, across Wyoming to the Rockies, and then southwest. In 1847, the Mormons stopped at the edge of the lonely desert near the Great Salt Lake.

The Mormons awarded plots of land to each family according to its size but held common ownership of two critical resources—water and timberland. Soon they had coaxed settlements and farms from the bleak landscape by irrigating their fields. Salt Lake City blossomed out of the land the Mormons called Deseret.

RESOLVING TERRITORIAL DISPUTES The Oregon Territory was only one point of contention between the United States and Britain. In the early 1840s, Great Britain still claimed areas in parts of what are now Maine and Minnesota. The Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842 settled these disputes in the East and the Midwest, but the two nations merely continued “joint occupation” of the Oregon Territory.

In 1844, Democrat James K. Polk’s presidential platform called for annexation of the entire Oregon Territory. Reflecting widespread support for Polk’s views, newspapers adopted the slogan “Fifty-Four Forty or Fight!” The slogan referred to the latitude 54˚40’, the northern limit of the disputed Oregon Territory. By the mid-1840s, however, the fur trade was in decline, and Britain’s interest in the territory waned. On the American side, Polk’s advisors deemed the land north of 49˚ latitude unsuited for agriculture. Consequently, the two countries peaceably agreed in 1846 to extend the mainland boundary with Canada along the forty-ninth parallel westward from the Rocky Mountains to Puget Sound, establishing the current U.S. boundary. Unfortunately, establishing the boundary in the Southwest would not be so easy.

Americans Headed West to...
- escape religious persecution
- find new markets for commerce
- claim land for farming, ranching, and mining
- locate harbors on the Pacific
- seek employment and avoid creditors after the panic of 1837
- spread the virtues of democracy

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Motives

Why did the Mormons move farther west in their search for a new home?
Mapping the Oregon Trail

In 1841, Congress appropriated $30,000 for a survey of the Oregon Trail. John C. Frémont was named to head the expeditions. Frémont earned his nickname “the Pathfinder” by leading four expeditions—which included artists, scientists, and cartographers, among them the German-born cartographer Charles Preuss—to explore the American West between 1842 and 1848. When Frémont submitted the report of his second expedition, Congress immediately ordered the printing of 10,000 copies, which were widely distributed.

The “Topographical Map of the Road from Missouri to Oregon,” drawn by Preuss, appeared in seven sheets. Though settlers first used this route in 1836, it was not until 1846 that Preuss published his map to guide them. The long, narrow map shown here is called a “strip” map, a map that shows a thin strip of the earth’s surface—in this case, the last stretch of the trail before reaching Fort Wallah-Wallah.

**THE WHITMAN MISSION**
The explorers came upon the Whitmans’ missionary station. They found thriving families living primarily on potatoes of a “remarkably good quality.”

**THE NEZ PERCE PRAIRIE**
Chief Looking Glass (left, in 1871) and the Nez Perce had “harmless” interactions with Frémont and his expedition.
October 10-11, 1843
October 11-12
October 12-13
October 14-15
October 15-16
October 16-17

**RESEARCH WEB LINKS**

**CROSSING THE MOUNTAINS**
Pioneers on the trail cut paths through the Blue Mountains, a wooded range that Frémont believed had been formed by "violent and extensive igneous [volcanic] action."

**RECORDING NATURAL RESOURCES**
On October 13, Frémont traveled through a desolate valley of the Columbia River to a region of "arable mountains," where he observed "nutritious grasses" and good soil that would support future flocks and herds.

**FORT BOÎSE (BOISE)**
This post became an important stopping point for settlers along the trail. Though salmon were plentiful in summer, Frémont noted that in the winter Native Americans often were forced to eat "every creeping thing, however loathsome and repulsive," to stay alive.

**THINKING CRITICALLY**

1. **Analyzing Patterns** Use the map to identify natural obstacles that settlers faced on the Oregon Trail.

2. **Creating a Thematic Map** Do research to find out more about early mapping efforts for other western trails. Then create a settler’s map of a small section of one trail. To help you decide what information you should show, pose some questions that a settler might have and that your map will answer. Then, sketch and label your map.

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R32.
Expansion in Texas

MAIN IDEA
Mexico offered land grants to American settlers, but conflict developed over religion and other cultural differences, and the issue of slavery.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW
Today, the state of Texas shares an important trading partnership with Mexico.

Terms & Names
- Stephen F. Austin
- land grant
- Antonio López de Santa Anna
- Texas Revolution
- Alamo
- Sam Houston
- Republic of Texas
- annex

One American's Story

In 1821, Stephen F. Austin led the first of several groups of American settlers to a fertile area “as good in every respect as man could wish for, land first rate, plenty of timber, fine water—beautifully rolling” along the Brazos River. However, Austin’s plans didn’t work out as well as he had hoped; 12 years later, he found himself in a Mexican prison and his new homeland in an uproar. After his release, Austin spoke about the impending crisis between Texas and Mexico.

A PERSONAL VOICE STEPHEN F. AUSTIN

“Texas needs peace, and a local government; its inhabitants are farmers, and they need a calm and quiet life. . . . [But] my efforts to serve Texas involved me in the labyrinth of Mexican politics. I was arrested, and have suffered a long persecution and imprisonment. . . . I fully hoped to have found Texas at peace and in tranquility, but regret to find it in commotion; all disorganized, all in anarchy, and threatened with immediate hostilities. . . . Can this state of things exist without precipitating the country into a war? I think it cannot.” —quoted in Texas: An Album of History

Austin’s warning proved to be prophetic. The conflict between Texas and Mexico would soon escalate into a bloody struggle.

Americans Settle in the Southwest

During three centuries of Spanish rule of Mexico, only a few thousand Mexican settlers had migrated to the vast landscape of what is now Texas. Despite the region’s rich natural resources and a climate conducive to agriculture, a number of problems scared off many potential Mexican settlers. One was the growing friction between Native American and Mexican inhabitants of the area.

THE MISSION SYSTEM Since the earliest Spanish settlements, the Native American and Mexican populations in the Southwest had come into close contact. Before Mexico won its independence in 1821, Spain’s system of Roman
Catholic missions in California, New Mexico, and Texas tried to convert Native Americans to Catholicism and to settle them on mission lands. To protect the missions, Spanish soldiers manned nearby presidios, or forts.

The mission system declined during the 1820s and 1830s, after Mexico had won its independence. After wresting the missions from Spanish control, the Mexican government offered the surrounding lands to government officials and ranchers. While some Native Americans were forced to remain as unpaid laborers, many others fled the missions, returning to traditional ways. When Mexicans captured Native Americans for forced labor, groups of hostile Comanche and Apache retaliated by sweeping through Texas, terrorizing Mexican settlements and stealing livestock that supported many American settlers and Mexican settlers, or Tejanos.

**THE IMPACT OF MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE** Trade opportunities between Mexico’s northern provinces and the United States multiplied. Tejano livestock, mostly longhorn cattle, provided tallow, hides, and other commercial goods to trade in Santa Fe, New Mexico, north and west of Texas.

Newly free, Mexico sought to improve its economy. Toward that end, the country eased trade restrictions and made trade with the United States more attractive than trade between northern Mexico and other sections of Mexico. Gradually, the ties loosened between Mexico and the northern provinces, which included present-day New Mexico, California, Texas, Arizona, Nevada, and Utah.

Mexico was beginning to discover what Spain had previously learned: owning a vast territory did not necessarily mean controlling it. Mexico City—the seat of Mexican government—lay far from the northern provinces and often seemed indifferent to the problems of settlers in Texas. Native American groups, such as the Apache and the Comanche, continued to threaten the thinly scattered Mexican settlements in New Mexico and Texas. Consequently, the Mexican government began to look for ways to strengthen ties between Mexico City and the northern provinces.

**MEXICO INVITES U.S. SETTLERS** To prevent border violations by horse thieves and to protect the territory from Native American attacks, the Mexican government encouraged American farmers to settle in Texas. In 1821, and again in 1823 and 1824, Mexico offered enormous land grants to agents, who were called empresarios. The empresarios, in turn, attracted American settlers, who eagerly bought cheap land in return for a pledge to obey Mexican laws and observe the official religion of Roman Catholicism.

Many Americans as well as Mexicans rushed at the chance. The same restless determination that produced new inventions and manufactured goods fed the American urge to remove any barrier to settlement of the West. The population of Anglo, or English-speaking, settlers from Europe and the United States soon surpassed the population of Tejanos who lived in Texas. Until the 1830s, the Anglo settlers lived as naturalized Mexican citizens.

**AUSTIN IN TEXAS** The most successful empresario, Stephen F. Austin, established a colony between the Brazos and Colorado rivers, where “no drunkard, no gambler, no profane swearer, and no idler” would be allowed. By 1825, Austin had issued 297 land grants to the group that later

**TEJANO CULTURE** The Anglo and Mexican cultures of Texas have shaped one another, especially in terms of music, food, and language.

For example, Tejano music reflects roots in Mexican mariachi as well as American country and western music and is now a $100 million a year industry. As for language, Tejanos often speak a mixture of Spanish and English called Spanglish.

As Enrique Madrid, who lives in the border area between Texas and Mexico, says, “We have two very powerful cultures coming to terms with each other every day on the banks of the Rio Grande and creating a new culture.”
became known as Texas’s Old Three Hundred. Each family received 177 very inexpensive acres of farmland, or 4,428 acres for stock grazing, as well as a 10-year exemption from paying taxes. “I am convinced,” Austin said, “that I could take on fifteen hundred families as easily as three hundred.”

At the colony’s capital in San Felipe, a visiting blacksmith, Noah Smithwick, described an established town, with “weddings and other social gatherings.” Smithwick stayed in a simple home but learned that “in the course of time the pole cabin gave place to a handsome brick house and that the rude furnishings were replaced by the best the country boasted.”

In 1836, Mary Austin Holley, Stephen Austin’s cousin, wrote admiringly about towns such as Galveston on the Gulf Coast and Bastrop.

A PERSONAL VOICE  MARY AUSTIN HOLLEY

“Bastrop... continues to grow rapidly. It is a favorite spot for new settlers, and is quite the rage at present.... It is situated on a bend of the [Colorado], sloping beautifully down to the water, with ranges of timber—first oak, then pine, then cedar, rising in regular succession behind it.”

—quoted in Texas: An Album of History

Word about Texas spread throughout the United States. Posters boldly stated, “Go To Texas!” Confident that Texas eventually would yield great wealth, Americans increasingly discussed extending the U.S. boundaries to the river they called the Rio Grande (known in Mexico as the Rio Bravo). President John Quincy Adams had previously offered to buy Texas for $1 million; President Andrew Jackson later upped the bid to $5 million. Mexico not only refused to sell Texas but also began to regret its hospitality to Anglo immigrants.

Texas Fights for Independence

As Texas’s Anglo population surged, tensions grew with Mexico over cultural differences, as well as slavery. The overwhelmingly Protestant settlers spoke English rather than Spanish. Many of the settlers were Southern cotton or sugar farmers who had brought slaves with them. Mexico, which had abolished slavery in 1824, insisted in vain that the Texans free their slaves.

“COME TO TEXAS” In 1830, Mexico sealed its borders and slapped a heavy tax on the importation of American goods. Mexico, however, lacked sufficient troops to police its borders well. Despite restrictions, the Anglo population of Texas doubled between 1830 and 1834. In 1834, Austin won a repeal of the prohibition on immigration. By 1835, more than 1,000 Anglos each month streamed into Texas, scrawling the initials “G.T.T.” on their doors to indicate that they had “Gone to Texas.” A year later, Texas’s population included only 3,500 Tejanos, 12,000 Native Americans, 45,000 Anglos, and 5,000 African Americans.

Meanwhile, Mexican politics became increasingly unstable. Austin had traveled to Mexico City late in 1833 to present petitions for greater self-government for Texas to Mexican president Antonio López de Santa Anna.

SANTA ANNA  1795–1876

Antonio López de Santa Anna began his career fighting for Spain in the war over Mexican independence. Later, he switched sides to fight for Mexico.

Declaring himself the “Napoleon of the West,” Santa Anna took control of the government about ten years after Mexico won independence in 1821. He spent the next 34 years alternately serving as president, leading troops into battle, and living in exile. He served as president 11 times. Santa Anna was a complex man with much charm. He sacrificed his considerable wealth to return again and again to the battlefield and died in poverty and almost forgotten.
While Austin was on his way home, Santa Anna suspended the 1824 Mexican constitution and had Austin imprisoned for inciting revolution. After Santa Anna revoked local powers in Texas and other Mexican states, several rebellions erupted, including what would eventually be known as the Texas Revolution.

“REMEMBER THE ALAMO!” Austin had argued with Santa Anna for self-government for Texas, but without success. Determined to force Texas to obey laws he had established, Santa Anna marched toward San Antonio at the head of a 4,000-member army. At the same time, Austin and his followers issued a call for Texans to arm themselves.

Late in 1835, the Texans attacked. They drove the Mexican forces from the Alamo, an abandoned mission and fort. In response, Santa Anna swept northward and stormed and destroyed the small American garrison in the Alamo. All 187 U.S. defenders died, including the famous frontiersmen Jim Bowie, who had designed the razor-sharp Bowie knife, and Davy Crockett, who sported a raccoon cap with a long tail hanging down his back. Hundreds of Mexicans also perished. Only a few women and children were spared.

THE LONE STAR REPUBLIC Later in March of 1836, Santa Anna’s troops executed 300 rebels at Goliad. The Alamo and Goliad victories would prove costly for Santa Anna. Six weeks after the defeat of the Alamo, on April 21, the Texans

---

**MAIN IDEA**

**Comparing** Compare the reasons for the Texas Revolution with the reasons for the American Revolution.

---

**INTERACTIVE**

Witness the action of the Battle of San Jacinto.
struck back. Led by **Sam Houston**, they defeated Santa Anna at the Battle of San Jacinto. With shouts of “Remember the Alamo!” the Texans killed 630 of Santa Anna’s soldiers in 18 minutes and captured Santa Anna. The victorious Texans set Santa Anna free after he signed the Treaty of Velasco, which granted independence to Texas. In September 1836, Houston became president of the **Republic of Texas**. The new “Lone Star Republic” set up an army and a navy and proudly flew its new silk flag with the lone gold star.

**TEXAS JOINS THE UNION** On March 2, 1836, as the battle for the Alamo was raging, Texans had declared their independence from Mexico. Believing that Mexico had deprived them of their fundamental rights, the Texas rebels had likened themselves to the American colonists who had chafed under British rule 60 years earlier. On March 16, they ratified a constitution based on that of the United States. In 1838, Sam Houston invited the United States to **annex**, or incorporate, the Texas republic into the United States. Most people within Texas hoped this would happen. U.S. opinion, however, divided along sectional lines. Southerners sought to extend slavery, already established in Texas. Northerners feared that annexation of more slave territory would tip the uneasy balance in the Senate in favor of slave states—and prompt war with Mexico.

Then in 1844, the U.S. presidential election featured a debate on westward expansion. The man who would win the presidency, James K. Polk, a slaveholder, firmly favored annexation of Texas “at the earliest practicable period.” On December 29, 1845, Texas became the 28th state in the Union. A furious Mexican government recalled its ambassador from Washington. Events were moving quickly toward war.
The War with Mexico

TAKING NOTES
Use the graphic organizer online to take notes about the war with Mexico and its effect on the U.S. border.

MAIN IDEA
Tensions over the U.S. annexation of Texas led to war with Mexico, resulting in huge territorial gains for the United States.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW
The United States has achieved its goal of expanding across the continent from east to west.

Terms & Names
- James K. Polk
- Zachary Taylor
- Stephen Kearny
- Republic of California
- Winfield Scott
- Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo
- Gadsden Purchase
- forty-niners
- gold rush

One American's Story
Robert E. Lee was born into a prominent Virginia family in 1807. His father had been a hero of the American Revolution. In 1846, the war with Mexico provided the 39-year-old captain with his first combat experience. Among the soldiers whom Lee directed in battle was his younger brother, Sidney Smith Lee. The elder Lee wrote about the battle.

A PERSONAL VOICE  ROBERT E. LEE
“...No matter where I turned, my eyes reverted to [my brother], and I stood by his gun whenever I was not wanted elsewhere. Oh, I felt awfully, and am at a loss what I should have done had he been cut down before me. I thank God that he was saved. . . . [The service from the American battery] was terrific, and the shells thrown from our battery were constant and regular discharges, so beautiful in their flight and so destructive in their fall. It was awful! My heart bled for the inhabitants. The soldiers I did not care so much for, but it was terrible to think of the women and children.”
—-a letter cited in R. E. Lee by Douglas Southall Freeman

In recoiling at the ugliness of the war with Mexico, Lee hardly stood alone. From the start, Americans hotly debated whether the United States should pursue the war.

Polk Urges War
Hostilities between the United States and Mexico, which had flared during the Texas Revolution in 1836, reignited over the American annexation of Texas in 1845. The two countries might have solved these issues peaceably if not for the continuing instability of the Mexican government and the territorial aspirations of the U.S. president, James K. Polk.
Polk now believed that war with Mexico would bring not only Texas but also New Mexico and California into the Union. The president supported Texas’s claims in disputes with Mexico over the Texas-Mexico border. While Texas insisted that its southern border extended to the Rio Grande, Mexico insisted that Texas’s border stopped at the Nueces River, 100 miles northeast of the Rio Grande.

**SLIDELL’S REJECTION** In 1844, Santa Anna was ousted as Mexico’s president. The Mexican political situation was confusing and unpredictable. In late 1845, “Polk the Purposeful” sent a Spanish-speaking emissary, John Slidell, to Mexico to purchase California and New Mexico and to gain approval of the Rio Grande as the Texas border. When Slidell arrived, Mexican officials refused to receive him. Hoping for Mexican aggression that would unify Americans behind a war, Polk then issued orders for General Zachary Taylor to march to the Rio Grande and blockade the river. Mexicans viewed this action as a violation of their rights.

Many Americans shared Polk’s goals for expansion, but public opinion was split over resorting to military action. Slavery would soon emerge as the key issue complicating this debate.

**SECTIONAL ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR** The idea of war unleashed great public celebrations. Volunteers swarmed recruiting stations, and the advent of daily newspapers, printed on new rotary presses, gave the war a romantic appeal.

Not everyone cheered. The abolitionist James Russell Lowell considered the war a “national crime committed in behalf of slavery, our common sin.” Even proslavery spokesman John C. Calhoun saw the perils of expansionism. Mexico, he said, was “the forbidden fruit; the penalty of eating it would be to subject our institutions to political death.”

Many Southerners, however, saw the annexation of Texas as an opportunity to extend slavery and increase Southern power in Congress. Furthermore, the Wilmot Proviso, a proposed amendment to a military appropriations bill of 1846, prohibited slavery in lands that might be gained from Mexico. This attack on slavery solidified Southern support for war by transforming the debate on war into a debate on slavery.

Northerners mainly opposed the war. Antislavery Whigs and abolitionists saw the war as a plot to expand slavery and ensure Southern domination of the Union. In a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts legislature, Charles Sumner proclaimed that “the lives of Mexicans are sacrificed in this cause; and a domestic question, which should be reserved for bloodless debate in our own country, is transferred to fields of battle in a foreign land.”

**The War Begins**

As Taylor positioned his forces at the Rio Grande in 1845–1846, John C. Frémont led an exploration party through Mexico’s Alta California province, another violation of Mexico’s territorial rights. The Mexican government had had enough.

Mexico responded to Taylor’s invasion of the territory it claimed by sending troops across the Rio Grande. In a skirmish near Matamoros, Mexican soldiers killed 9 U.S. soldiers. Polk immediately sent a war message to Congress, declaring that by shedding “American blood upon American soil,” Mexico had started the war. Representative Abraham Lincoln questioned the truthfulness of the message, asking “whether our citizens, whose blood was shed, as in his message declared, were or were not, at that time, armed officers and soldiers, sent into that settlement by the military order of the President.” Lincoln introduced a “Spot Resolution,” asking Polk to certify the spot where the skirmish had occurred.
Truthful or not, Polk’s message persuaded the House to recognize a state of war with Mexico by a vote of 174 to 14, and the Senate by a vote of 40 to 2, with numerous abstentions. Some antislavery Whigs had tried to oppose the war but were barely allowed to gain the floor of Congress to speak. Since Polk withheld key facts, the full reality of what had happened on the distant Rio Grande was not known. But the theory and practice of manifest destiny had launched the United States into its first war on foreign territory.

### KEARNY MARCHES WEST

In 1846, as part of his plan to seize New Mexico and California, Polk ordered Colonel Stephen Kearny to march from Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, across the desert to Santa Fe, New Mexico. Kearny earned the nickname “the Long Marcher” as he and his men crossed 800 miles of barren ground. They were met in Santa Fe by a New Mexican contingent that included upper-class Mexicans who wanted to join the United States. New Mexico fell to the United States without a shot being fired. After dispatching some of his troops south to Mexico, the Long Marcher led the rest on another long trek, this time to southern California.

### THE REPUBLIC OF CALIFORNIA

By the turn of the 19th century, Spanish settlers had set up more than 20 missions along the California coast. After independence, the Mexican government took over these missions, just as it had done in Texas. By the late 1830s, about 12,000 Mexican settlers had migrated to California to set up cattle ranches, where they pressed Native Americans into service as workers. By the mid-1840s, about 500 U.S. settlers also lived in California.

Polk’s offer to buy California in 1845 aroused the indignation of the Mexican government. A group of American settlers, led by Frémont, seized the town of Sonoma in June 1846. Hoisting a flag that featured a grizzly bear, the rebels proudly declared their independence from Mexico and proclaimed the nation of the Republic of California. Kearny arrived from New Mexico and joined forces with Frémont and a U.S. naval expedition led by Commodore John D. Sloat. The Mexican troops quickly gave way, leaving U.S. forces in control of California.

### THE WAR IN MEXICO

For American troops in Mexico, one military victory followed another. Though Mexican soldiers gallantly defended their own soil, their army labored under poor leadership. In contrast, U.S. soldiers served under some of the nation’s best officers, such as Captain Robert E. Lee and Captain Ulysses S. Grant, both West Point graduates.
The American invasion of Mexico lasted about a year and featured a pair of colorful generals, Zachary Taylor and Winfield Scott. Affectionately nicknamed “Old Rough and Ready” because he sported a casual straw hat and plain brown coat, Taylor attacked and captured Monterrey, Mexico, in September 1846, but allowed the Mexican garrison to escape.

Meanwhile, Polk hatched a bizarre scheme with Santa Anna, who had been living in exile in Cuba. If Polk would help him sneak back to Mexico, Santa Anna promised he would end the war and mediate the border dispute. Polk agreed, but when Santa Anna returned to Mexico, he resumed the presidency, took command of the army and, in February 1847, ordered an attack on Taylor’s forces at Buena Vista. Though the Mexican army boasted superior numbers, its soldiers suffered from exhaustion. Taylor’s more rested troops pushed Santa Anna into Mexico’s interior.

Scott’s forces took advantage of Santa Anna’s failed strategy and captured Veracruz in March. General Scott always wore a full-dress blue uniform with a yellow sash, which won him the nickname “Old Fuss and Feathers.” Scott supervised an amphibious landing at Veracruz, in which an army of 10,000 landed on an
island off Veracruz in 200 ships and ferried 67 boats in less than 5 hours. Scott’s troops then set off for Mexico City, which they captured on September 14, 1847. Covering 260 miles, Scott’s army had lost not a single battle.

**America Gains the Spoils of War**

For Mexico, the war in which it lost at least 25,000 lives and nearly half its land marked an ugly milestone in its relations with the United States. America’s victory came at the cost of about 13,000 lives. Of these, nearly 2,000 died in battle or from wounds and more than 11,000 perished from diseases, such as yellow fever. However, the war enlarged U.S. territory by approximately one-third.

**THE TREATY OF GUADALUPE HIDALGO** On February 2, 1848, the United States and Mexico signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Mexico agreed to the Rio Grande border for Texas and ceded New Mexico and California to the United States. The United States agreed to pay $15 million for the Mexican cession, which included present-day California, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, most of Arizona, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming. The treaty guaranteed Mexicans living in these territories freedom of religion, protection of property, bilingual elections, and open borders.

Five years later, in 1853, President Franklin Pierce would authorize his emissary James Gadsden to pay Mexico an additional $10 million for another piece of territory south of the Gila River. Along with the settlement of Oregon and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the Gadsden Purchase established the current borders of the lower 48 states.

**TAYLOR’S ELECTION IN 1848** In 1848 the Democrats nominated Lewis Cass for president and hesitated about the extension of slavery into America’s vast new holdings. A small group of antislavery Democrats nominated Martin Van Buren to lead the Free-Soil Party, which supported a congressional prohibition on the extension of slavery into the territories. Van Buren captured 10 percent of the popular vote and no electoral votes. The Whig nominee, war hero Zachary Taylor, easily won the election. Taylor’s victory, however, was soon overshadowed by a glittering discovery in one of America’s new territories.

**The California Gold Rush**

In January 1848, James Marshall, an American carpenter working on John Sutter’s property in the California Sierra Nevadas, discovered gold at Sutter’s Mill. Word of the chance discovery traveled east.

**THE RUSH BEGINS** Soon after the news reached San Francisco, residents traveled to the Sacramento Valley in droves to pan for gold. Lacking staff and readers, San Francisco’s newspaper, the Californian, suspended publication. An editorial in the final issue, dated May 29, complained that the whole country “resounds with the sordid cry of gold, GOLD, GOLD! while the field is left half-plowed, the house half-built, and everything neglected but the manufacture of shovels and pickaxes.”

**LOS NIÑOS HÉROES**

Though most Americans know little about the war with Mexico, Mexicans view the war as a crucial event in their history. On September 14, 1847, General Winfield Scott captured Mexico City after the hard-fought Battle of Chapultepec, the site of the Mexican military academy. There, six young cadets leaped from Chapultepec Castle to commit suicide rather than surrender to the U.S. Army. A monument (shown above) that honors los Niños Héroes (the boy heroes) inspires pilgrimages every September.
“THE WAY THEY GO TO CALIFORNIA”

This cartoon lithograph by Nathaniel Currier (1813–1888) was inspired by the California gold rush. Currier was a founder of the Currier and Ives company, which became famous for detailed lithographs of 19th-century daily life. Here Currier portrays some of the hordes of prospectors who flocked from all over the world to California in 1849. The mob wields picks and shovels, desperate to find any means of transport to the “Golden West.” While some miners dive into the water, weighed down by heavy tools, one clever prospector has invented a new type of airship to speed him to the treasure.

**SKILLBUILDER**
**Analyzing Political Cartoons**

1. How has the cartoonist added humor to this portrayal of the gold seekers?
2. What clues tell you that this cartoon is about the California gold rush?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R13.

On June 6, 1848, Monterey’s Mayor Walter Colton sent a scout to report on what was happening. After the scout returned on June 14, the mayor described the scene that had taken place in the middle of the town’s main street.

**A PERSONAL VOICE**  **WALTER COLTON**

“The blacksmith dropped his hammer, the carpenter his plane, the mason his trowel, the farmer his sickle, the baker his loaf, and the tapster his bottle. All were off for the mines. . . . I have only a community of women left, and a gang of prisoners, with here and there a soldier who will give his captain the slip at first chance. I don’t blame the fellow a whit; seven dollars a month, while others are making two or three hundred a day!”

—quoted in *California: A Bicentennial History*

As gold fever traveled eastward, overland migration to California skyrocketed, from 400 in 1848 to 44,000 in 1850. The rest of the world soon caught the fever. Among the so-called **forty-niners**, the prospectors who flocked to California in 1849 in the **gold rush**, were people from Asia, South America, and Europe.

**IMPACT OF GOLD FEVER** Because of its location as a supply center, San Francisco became “a pandemonium of a city,” according to one traveler. Indeed, the city’s population exploded from 1,000 in 1848 to 35,000 in 1850. Ferrying people and supplies, ships clogged San Francisco’s harbor with a forest of masts.

Louisa Clapp and her husband, Fayette, left the comforts of a middle-class family in New England to join the gold rush for adventure. After living in San Francisco for more than a year, the Clapps settled in a log cabin in the interior.
These miners are prospecting in Spanish Flat, California, in 1852.

**A Personal Voice**

LOUISA CLAPP

“I have become a mineress; that is, if having washed a pan of dirt with my own hands, and procured therefrom three dollars and twenty-five cents in gold dust . . . will entitle me to the name. I can truly say, with the blacksmith’s apprentice at the close of his first day’s work at the anvil, that ‘I am sorry I learned the trade;’ for I wet my feet, tore my dress, spoilt a pair of new gloves, nearly froze my fingers, got an awful headache, took cold and lost a valuable breastpin, in this my labor of love.”

—quoted in *They Saw the Elephant*

**GOLD RUSH BRINGS DIVERSITY** By 1849, California’s population exceeded 100,000. The Chinese were the largest group to come from overseas. Free blacks also came by the hundreds, and many struck it rich. By 1855, the wealthiest African Americans in the country were living in California. The fast-growing population included large numbers of Mexicans as well. The California demographic mix also included slaves—that is until a constitutional convention in 1849 drew up a state constitution that outlawed slavery.

California’s application for statehood provoked fiery protest in Congress and became just one more sore point between irate Northerners and Southerners, each intent on winning the sectional argument over slavery. Nevertheless, California did win statehood in 1850.

---

**MAIN IDEA**

2. **TAKING NOTES**

Draw a chart showing how the boundaries of the contiguous United States were formed.

**Effect:** Present-Day U.S. Borders

**Causes:**

How did the United States pursue its goal of expanding in the 1840s?

**CRITICAL THINKING**

3. **EVALUATING**

How would you evaluate President Polk’s attitude and behavior toward Mexico? Use specific references to the chapter to support your response. **Think About:**

- Polk’s position on expansion
- his actions once in office
- his relationship with Santa Anna

4. **ANALYZING EFFECTS**

What were some of the effects of the California gold rush?

5. **EVALUATING DECISIONS**

Would you have supported the controversial war with Mexico? Why or why not? Explain your answer, including details from the chapter.
TERMS & NAMES
For each term or name below, write a sentence explaining its connection to the expansion of the U.S. in the mid-19th century.

1. Samuel F. B. Morse
2. manifest destiny
3. Oregon Trail
4. Brigham Young
5. Antonio López de Santa Anna
6. Alamo
7. Sam Houston
8. Republic of Texas
9. James K. Polk
10. Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo

MAIN IDEAS
Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

The Market Revolution (pages 274–279)
1. What inventions and technological advancements changed lives as part of the market revolution?
2. How did the inventions and innovations of the mid-19th century encourage various regions to specialize in certain industries?

Manifest Destiny (pages 280–285)
3. Why was the concept of manifest destiny of particular appeal to Americans in the 1840s?
4. What were the factors that drew settlers west during the first half of the 19th century?

Expansion in Texas (pages 288–292)
5. What made Americans want to settle in Texas?
6. What were the major events that led to Texas joining the Union?

The War with Mexico (pages 293–299)
7. What developments caused the United States to go to war with Mexico?
8. What effect did the gold rush have on the growth of California?

CRITICAL THINKING
1. USING YOUR NOTES What were America’s goals and ideals during this period of expansion and economic change? Draw a chart in which you list goals from the period, how they were achieved, and in what ways their effects were positive or negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>How Achieved</th>
<th>Positive/Negative Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. INTERPRETING MAPS Review the map on pages 286–287. In what ways would this map have been helpful to settlers following the Oregon Trail to a new home? Explain your answer.

3. ANALYZING EFFECTS What was the impact of the new methods of communication during this period? Use details from the text to support your response.
Use the map and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer questions 1 and 2.

1. Which area on the map corresponds to the label “Mexican Cession, 1848”?
   - A Area A
   - B Area B
   - C Area C
   - D Area D

2. Which area on the map corresponds to the label “Oregon territory”?
   - F Area A
   - G Area B
   - H Area C
   - J Area D

Use the quotation below and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer question 3.

“[T]he right of our manifest destiny to over spread and to possess the whole of the continent which Providence has given us for the development of the great experiment of liberty and . . . development of self government entrusted to us. It is [a] right such as that of the tree to the space of air and the earth suitable for the full expansion of its principle and destiny of growth.”

—John L. O’Sullivan, United States Magazine and Democratic Review

3. In this passage, the writer uses the term “manifest destiny” to mean that —
   - A expansion is not only good but bound to happen.
   - B neighboring territories will resent U.S. expansion.
   - C America’s growth can be compared to a tree.
   - D self-government leads to expansion.

4. All of the following were outcomes of the California Gold Rush except —
   - F increased diversity in the region.
   - G the rapid growth of San Francisco.
   - H an increase in overland migration.
   - J the expansion of slavery in California.

INTERACT WITH HISTORY

Think about the issues you explored at the beginning of the chapter. Organize into small groups and hold a debate about the way the United States acquired land from Mexico. Use information from the chapter to support your viewpoint.

FOCUS ON WRITING

Imagine you are a member of Congress, and you believe that the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo is flawed. Write a different version of the treaty for Congress to adopt. For each main point in your treaty, compare it to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and explain why your version is better.

MULTIMEDIA ACTIVITY

Visit the links for Chapter Assessment to find out more about the revolution in technology and communication in the first half of the 19th century. What invention most appeals to you, and why? Prepare a multimedia presentation that describes the impact that your favorite invention had on society at the time.

For additional test practice, go online for:
- Diagnostic tests
- Tutorials

hmhsocialstudies.com
When gold was discovered in northern California in 1848, it caused a sensation. Gold seekers from the United States and the rest of the world rushed to California to find their fortunes. The conditions of the trip were difficult, as was the labor required to extract the gold from rivers and mines. Although some people became wealthy, many more never found the riches they had expected. So many people arrived so quickly that California became a state within three years of gold being discovered.

Explore some of the history and documents of the California Gold Rush online. You can find a wealth of information, video clips, primary sources, activities, and more at hmhsocialstudies.com.
“If any man has his health &
will work, he can make more
than ten times as much here
as he can in the states in
the same length of time. But
many, very many, that come
here meet with bad success
& thousands will leave their
bones here.”

— S. Shufelt
THE UNION IN PERIL

Essential Question
How did conflict over slavery and other regional tensions lead to the Civil War?

What You Will Learn
In this chapter you will learn how rising tensions over the issue of slavery led to a split in the nation that culminated in war.

SECTION 1: The Divisive Politics of Slavery
Main Idea The issue of slavery dominated U.S. politics in the early 1850s.

SECTION 2: Protest, Resistance, and Violence
Main Idea Proslavery and antislavery factions disagreed over the treatment of fugitive slaves and the spread of slavery to the territories.

SECTION 3: The Birth of the Republican Party
Main Idea In the mid-1850s, the issue of slavery and other factors split political parties and led to the birth of new ones.

SECTION 4: Slavery and Secession
Main Idea A series of controversial events heightened the sectional conflict that brought the nation to the brink of war.

How did conflict over slavery and other regional tensions lead to the Civil War?

What You Will Learn

1850 | Congress passes Compromise of 1850.
1850 | California enters the Union.
1852 | Franklin Pierce is elected president.
1852 | Harriet Beecher Stowe publishes Uncle Tom's Cabin.
1854 | Congress approves the Kansas-Nebraska Act.
1854 | The Republican Party forms.
1850 | Taiping Rebellion in China begins.
1853 | Crimean War begins.
1854 | Charles Dickens's Hard Times is published.
The year is 1850. Across the United States a debate is raging, dividing North from South: Is slavery a property right, or is it a violation of liberty and human dignity? The future of the Union depends on compromise—but for many people on both sides, compromise is unacceptable.

**Explore the Issues**

- Is it possible to compromise on an ethical issue such as slavery?
- What are the obstacles to altering an institution, such as slavery, that is fundamental to a region’s economy and way of life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Buchanan is elected president.</td>
<td>The Supreme Court rules against Dred Scott.</td>
<td>Abraham Lincoln is elected president.</td>
<td>John Brown attacks the arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia.</td>
<td>The Confederacy is formed.</td>
<td>Russian serfs emancipated by Czar Alexander II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The issue of slavery dominated U.S. politics in the early 1850s.

U.S. society continues to be challenged by issues of fairness, equality, race, and class.

Terms & Names
- Wilmot Proviso
- secession
- Compromise of 1850
- popular sovereignty
- Stephen A. Douglas
- Millard Fillmore

South Carolina senator John C. Calhoun was so sick that he had missed four months of debate over whether California should enter the Union as a free state. On March 4, 1850, Calhoun, explaining that he was too ill to deliver a prepared speech, asked Senator James M. Mason of Virginia to deliver it for him.

"I have, Senators, believed from the first that the agitation of the subject of slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion. . . . The agitation has been permitted to proceed. . . until it has reached a period when it can no longer be disguised or denied that the Union is in danger. You have thus had forced upon you the greatest and the gravest question that can ever come under your consideration: How can the Union be preserved?"

—quoted in The Compromise of 1850, edited by Edwin C. Rozwenc

Senator Calhoun called on the North to give the South “justice, simple justice.” He demanded that slavery be allowed throughout the territories won in the war with Mexico. If it was not, he declared, the South would secede, or withdraw, from the Union. Once again, the issue of slavery had brought about a political crisis, deepening the gulf between the North and the South.

**Differences Between North and South**

Senator Calhoun argued that although the North and the South had been politically equal when the Constitution was adopted, the “perfect equilibrium” between the two sections no longer existed. At any rate, the two sections certainly had developed different ways of life by the 1850s.

**INDUSTRY AND IMMIGRATION IN THE NORTH** The North industrialized rapidly as factories turned out ever-increasing amounts of products, from textiles and sewing machines to farm equipment and guns. Railroads—with more than 20,000 miles of track laid during the 1850s—carried raw materials eastward and...
manufactured goods and settlers westward. Small towns like Chicago matured into cities almost overnight, due to the sheer volume of goods and people arriving by railroad. Telegraph wires strung along the railroad tracks provided a network of instant communication for the North.

Immigrants from Europe entered the industrial workplace in growing numbers. Many became voters with a strong opposition to slavery. They feared the expansion of slavery for two main reasons. First, it might bring slave labor into direct competition with free labor, or people who worked for wages. Second, it threatened to reduce the status of white workers who could not successfully compete with slaves.

**AGRICULTURE AND SLAVERY IN THE SOUTH** Unlike the North, the South remained a predominantly rural society, consisting mostly of plantations and small farms. The Southern economy relied on staple crops such as cotton. Though one-third of the nation's population lived in the South in 1850, the South produced under 10 percent of the nation's manufactured goods. At the same time that Northern railroad lines were expanding, Southerners were mostly using rivers to transport goods. In addition, few immigrants settled in the South, because African Americans, whether enslaved or free, met most of the available need for artisans, mechanics, and laborers. Those immigrants who did settle in the South, however, displayed significant opposition to slavery. For example, German-American newspapers in Texas and in Baltimore, Maryland published editorials in favor of universal voting rights and freedom for African Americans.

The conflict over slavery rattled Southern society. In three Southern states, Mississippi, Louisiana, and South Carolina, African Americans were in the majority. In Alabama and Florida, African Americans composed almost half of the population. While blacks dreamed of an end to slavery, many Southern whites feared that any restriction of slavery would lead to a social and economic revolution. Furthermore, Calhoun warned that such a revolution would condemn blacks as well as whites “to the greatest calamity, and the [South] to poverty, desolation, and wretchedness.”

**GREEK REVIVAL ARCHITECTURE**

The Greek Revival was an architectural style that spread throughout the United States between 1825 and 1860. Like ancient Greek temples, many buildings in this style had columns on all four sides. This style was applied to all types of buildings in Greek Revival architecture, from small houses to state capitols. The hot, humid climate of the South encouraged the development of a high porch and with columns rising to the full height of a building. These wide porches were unusual in the cooler climate of Europe but well-suited to tropical regions. In the hands of Greek Revival architects in the South, the porches became grand living spaces where families could find shelter from the summer heat.

**SKILLBUILDER**

1. How would you be able to tell that this home is an example of the Greek Revival style?
2. How did the architecture help cool the house?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R23.
Slavery in the Territories

On August 8, 1846, Pennsylvania Democrat David Wilmot heightened tensions between North and South by introducing an amendment to a military appropriations bill proposing that “neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever exist” in any territory the United States might acquire as a result of the war with Mexico. In strictly practical terms, the Wilmot Proviso meant that California, as well as the territories of Utah and New Mexico, would be closed to slavery forever.

**THE WILMOT PROVISO** The Wilmot Proviso divided Congress along regional lines. Northerners, angry over the refusal of Southern congressmen to vote for internal improvements, such as the building of canals and roads, supported the proviso. They also feared that adding slave territory would give slave states more members in Congress and deny economic opportunity to free workers.

Southerners, as expected, opposed the proviso, which, some argued, raised complex constitutional issues. Slaves were property, Southerners claimed, and property was protected by the Constitution. Laws like the Wilmot Proviso would undermine such constitutional protections.

Many Southerners feared that if the Wilmot Proviso became law, the inevitable addition of new free states to the Union would shift the balance of power permanently to the North. The House of Representatives approved the proviso, but the Senate rejected it. Congressman Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia issued a dire prediction.

---

**A PERSONAL VOICE** ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS

“The North is going to stick the Wilmot amendment to every appropriation and then all the South will vote against any measure thus clogged. Finally a tremendous struggle will take place and perhaps [President] Polk in starting one war may find half a dozen on his hands. I tell you the prospect ahead is dark, cloudy, thick and gloomy.”

—quoted in *The Coming of the Civil War*

**STATEHOOD FOR CALIFORNIA** As a result of the gold rush, California had grown in population so quickly that it skipped the territorial phase of becoming a state. In late 1849, California held a constitutional convention, adopted a state constitution, elected a governor and a legislature, and applied to join the Union.

California’s new constitution forbade slavery, a fact that alarmed many Southerners. They had assumed that because most of California lay south of the Missouri Compromise line of 36˚30’, the state would be open to slavery. They had hoped that the compromise, struck in 1820, would apply to new territories, including California, which would have become a slave state.

General Zachary Taylor, who succeeded Polk as president in 1849, supported California’s admission as a free state. Moreover, he felt that the South could counter abolitionism most effectively by leaving the slavery issue up to individual territories rather than to Congress. Southerners, however, saw this as a move to block slavery in the territories and as an attack on the Southern way of life—and began to question whether the South should remain in the Union.

---

**SKILLBUILDER** Interpreting Charts

About what percentage of House members represented free states in 1850?

**MAIN IDEA**

**ANALYZING MOTIVES**

B Explain why Northerners favored the Wilmot Proviso and why Southerners did not.

**ANALYZING EFFECTS**

C Why did California’s application for statehood cause an uproar?
Comparing

Northern issues and Southern issues were addressed by the Compromise of 1850?

The Senate Debates

The 31st Congress opened in December 1849 in an atmosphere of distrust and bitterness. The question of California statehood topped the agenda. Of equal concern was the border dispute in which the slave state of Texas claimed the eastern half of New Mexico Territory, where the issue of slavery had not yet been settled. In the meantime, Northerners demanded the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, while Southerners accused the North of failing to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act of 1793. As passions rose, some Southerners threatened secession, the formal withdrawal of a state from the Union. Could anything be done to prevent the United States from becoming two nations?

Clay's Compromise

Henry Clay worked night and day to shape a compromise that both the North and the South could accept. Though ill, he visited his old rival Daniel Webster on January 21, 1850, and obtained Webster’s support. Eight days later, Clay presented to the Senate a series of resolutions later called the Compromise of 1850, which he hoped would settle “all questions in controversy between the free and slave states, growing out of the subject of Slavery.”

Terms of the Compromise

Clay’s compromise (summarized on the chart shown on page 308) contained provisions to appease Northerners as well as Southerners. To satisfy the North, the compromise provided that California be admitted to the Union as a free state. To satisfy the South, the compromise proposed a new and more effective fugitive slave law.

Other provisions of the compromise had elements that appealed to both regions. For example, a provision that allowed residents of the territories of New Mexico and Utah popular sovereignty—the right of residents of a territory to vote for or against slavery—appealed to both North and South. As part of the compromise, the federal government would pay Texas $10 million to surrender its claim to New Mexico. Northerners were pleased because, in effect, it limited slavery in Texas to within its current borders. Southerners were pleased because the money would help defray Texas’s expenses and debts from the war with Mexico.

1. Daniel Webster strongly supported Clay’s compromise. He left the Senate before Stephen Douglas could engineer passage of all the provisions of the compromise.

2. Henry Clay offered his compromise to the Senate in January 1850. In his efforts to save the Union, Clay earned the name “the Great Compromiser.”

3. John C. Calhoun opposed the compromise. He died two months after Clay proposed it.
On February 5, Clay defended his resolutions and begged both the North and the South to consider them thoughtfully. The alternative was disunion—and, in Clay’s opinion, quite possibly war.

**A Personal Voice  Henry Clay**

“And such a war as it would be, following the dissolution of the Union! Sir, we may search the pages of history, and none so ferocious, so bloody, so implacable, so exterminating . . . would rage with such violence. . . . I implore gentlemen, I adjure them, whether from the South or the North . . . to pause at the edge of the precipice, before the fearful and dangerous leap be taken into the yawning abyss below.”

—quoted in *Voices from the Civil War*

**Calhoun and Webster Respond**  Clay’s speech marked the start of one of the greatest political debates in United States history. Within a month, Calhoun had presented the Southern case for slavery in the territories. He was followed three days later by Daniel Webster, who began his eloquent appeal for national unity by saying, “I wish to speak today, not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a Northern man, but as an American. . . . ‘Hear me for my cause.’” He urged Northerners to try to compromise with the South by passing a stricter fugitive slave law, and he warned Southern firebrands to think more cautiously about the danger of secession.

**A Personal Voice  Daniel Webster**

“I hear with pain, and anguish, and distress, the word *secession*, especially when it falls from the lips of those who are eminently patriotic. . . . Secess! Peaceable secession! . . . There can be no such thing as a peaceable secession. . . . Is the great Constitution under which we live . . . to be thawed and melted away by secession. . . . No, sir! I will not state what might produce the disruption of the states; . . . [What] that disruption must produce . . . [would be] such a war as I will not describe.”

—Seventh of March speech, quoted in *The American Spirit*

---

**The Compromise of 1850**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calhoun’s Goals</th>
<th>Terms of the Compromise</th>
<th>Webster’s Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Calhoun believed strongly in states’ rights over federal power and held the interests of the slaveholding South as his highest priority. He had long believed that “the agitation of the subject of slavery would . . . end in disunion.” He blamed the sectional crisis on Northern abolitionists and argued that the South had “no concession or surrender to make” on the issue of slavery. | • California admitted as a free state  
• Utah and New Mexico territories decide about slavery  
• Texas-New Mexico boundary dispute resolved; Texas paid $10 million by federal government.  
• The sale of slaves banned in the District of Columbia. But slavery itself may continue there.  
• Fugitive Slave Act required people in the free states to help capture and return escaped slaves. | Webster had argued with Northern Whigs that slavery should not be extended into the territories. Upon hearing Calhoun’s threat of secession, he took to the Senate floor and endorsed Clay’s compromise “for the preservation of the Union. . . . a great, popular, constitution-al government, guarded by legislation, by law, by judicature, and defended by the whole affections of the people.” |

**SkillBuilder  Interpreting Charts**

1. How did Calhoun and Webster disagree over states’ rights?  
2. How did the compromise try to satisfy both sides?
Webster’s speech became one of the most famous in the history of the Senate. Spectators packed the Senate chamber for the event.

THE COMPROMISE IS ADOPTED The Senate rejected the proposed compromise in July. Discouraged, Clay left Washington. Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois picked up the pro-compromise reins.

To avoid another defeat, Douglas developed a shrewd plan. He unbundled the package of resolutions and reintroduced them one at a time, hoping to obtain a majority vote for each measure individually. Thus, any individual congressman could vote for the provisions that he liked and vote against, or abstain from voting on, those that he disliked. It appeared as though Douglas had found the key to passing the entire compromise.

The unexpected death of President Taylor on July 9 aided Douglas’s efforts. Taylor’s successor, Millard Fillmore, made it clear that he supported the compromise. In the meantime, the South was ready to negotiate. Calhoun’s death had removed one obstacle to compromise. Southern leaders came out in favor of Clay’s individual proposals as being the best the South could secure without radical action. After eight months of effort, the Compromise of 1850 was voted into law.

President Fillmore embraced the compromise as the “final settlement” of the question of slavery and sectional differences. For the moment, the crisis over slavery in the territories had passed. However, the relief was short-lived. Even as crowds in Washington celebrated the passage of the compromise, the next crisis loomed ominously on the horizon—enforcement of the new fugitive slave law.

Analyzing Effects

What was the result of Douglas’s unbundling of Clay’s resolutions?

1. TERMS & NAMES For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.

   • Wilmot Proviso
   • Compromise of 1850
   • Stephen A. Douglas
   • Millard Fillmore
   • secession
   • popular sovereignty

2. TAKING NOTES

   Create a chart similar to this one. Complete it by indicating each region’s position on an issue or trend covered in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue or Trend</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   How was each region affected by the issue or trend?

3. HYPOTHESIZING

   Do you think there are any points at which a different action or leader might have resolved the conflict between the North and the South? Support your opinion with references from this section. Think About:

   • issues raised by the Wilmot Proviso, California statehood, and the Compromise of 1850
   • constitutional issues raised by Southerners

4. ANALYZING PRIMARY SOURCES

   When California applied for statehood in 1850, Mississippi senator Jefferson Davis warned, “For the first time, we are about permanently to destroy the balance of power between the sections.” Why might Davis have felt this way?

5. EVALUATING

   Do you think the North or the South won more significant concessions in the Compromise of 1850? Explain your answer.
Proslavery and antislavery factions disagreed over the treatment of fugitive slaves and the spread of slavery to the territories.

The antislavery leaders became role models for leaders of civil rights movements in the 20th century.

Terms & Names
- Fugitive Slave Act
- personal liberty laws
- Underground Railroad
- Harriet Tubman
- Harriet Beecher Stowe
- Uncle Tom’s Cabin
- Kansas-Nebraska Act
- John Brown
- Bleeding Kansas

**One American’s Story**

On June 2, 1854, thousands lined the streets of Boston. Flags flew at half-mast, and a black coffin bearing the words “The Funeral of Liberty” dangled from a window. Federal soldiers, bayonets ready for action, marched a lone African American, Anthony Burns, toward the harbor. Charlotte Forten, a free black, wrote about the day.

“A PERSONAL VOICE  CHARLOTTE FORTEN

“Today Massachusetts has again been disgraced... With what scorn must that government be regarded, which cowardly assembles thousands of soldiers to satisfy the demands of slaveholders; to deprive of his freedom a man, created in God’s own image, whose sole offense is the color of his skin!... A cloud seems hanging over me, over all our persecuted race, which nothing can dispel.”

—quoted in The Underground Railroad, by Charles L. Blockson

Anthony Burns was being forced back into slavery in Virginia. As a result of his trial, antislavery sentiment in the North soared. “We went to bed one night old-fashioned, conservative, compromise Union Whigs,” wrote one Northerner, “and waked up stark mad Abolitionists.”

**Fugitive Slaves and the Underground Railroad**

Burns’s return to slavery followed the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, which was a component of the Compromise of 1850. Many people were surprised by the harsh terms of the act. Under the law, alleged fugitives were not entitled to a trial by jury, despite the Sixth Amendment provision calling for a speedy and public jury trial and the right to counsel. Nor could fugitives testify on their own behalf.
A statement by a slave owner was all that was required to have a slave returned. Frederick Douglass bitterly summarized the situation.

**A PERSONAL VOICE** FREDERICK DOUGLASS

"The colored men’s rights are less than those of a jackass. No man can take away a jackass without submitting the matter to twelve men in any part of this country. A black man may be carried away without any reference to a jury. It is only necessary to claim him, and that some villain should swear to his identity. There is more protection there for a horse, for a donkey, or anything, rather than a colored man."

—quoted in Voices from the Civil War

Federal commissioners charged with enforcing the law were to receive a $10 fee if they returned an alleged fugitive, but only $5 if they freed him or her, an obvious incentive to “return” people to slavery. Finally, anyone convicted of helping an alleged fugitive was subject to a fine of $1,000, imprisonment for six months, or both.

**RESISTING THE LAW** Infuriated by the Fugitive Slave Act, some Northerners resisted it by organizing vigilance committees to send endangered African Americans to safety in Canada. Others resorted to violence to rescue fugitive slaves. Nine Northern states passed **personal liberty laws**, which forbade the imprisonment of runaway slaves and guaranteed that they would have jury trials. And Northern lawyers dragged these trials out—often for three or four years—in order to increase slave catchers’ expenses. Southern slave owners were enraged by Northern resistance to the Fugitive Slave Act, prompting one Harvard law student from Georgia to tell his mother, “Do not be surprised if when I return home you find me a confirmed disunionist.”

**HARRIET TUBMAN AND THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD** As time went on, free African Americans and white abolitionists developed a secret network of people who would, at great risk to themselves, aid fugitive slaves in their escape. This network became known as the **Underground Railroad.** The “conductors” hid fugitives in secret tunnels and false cupboards, provided them with food and clothing, and escorted or directed them to the next “station,” often in disguise.

One of the most famous conductors was **Harriet Tubman,** born a slave in 1820 or 1821. As a young girl, she suffered a severe head injury when a plantation overseer hit her with a lead weight. The blow damaged her brain, causing her to lose consciousness several times a day. To compensate for her disability, Tubman increased her strength until she became strong enough to perform tasks that most men could not do. In 1849, after Tubman’s owner died, she decided to make a break for freedom and succeeded in reaching Philadelphia.

Shortly after passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, Tubman became a conductor on the Underground Railroad. In all, she made 19 trips back to the South and is said to have helped 300 slaves—including her own parents—flee to freedom. Neither Tubman nor the slaves she helped were ever captured. Later she became an ardent speaker for abolition.

For slaves, escaping from slavery was indeed a dangerous process. It meant traveling on foot at night without any sense of distance or direction except for the North Star and other natural signs. It meant avoiding patrols of armed men on horseback and struggling through forests and across rivers. Often it meant going...

With a price of $40,000 on her head, Harriet Tubman was called “Moses” by those she helped escape on the Underground Railroad.
KEY PLAYER

HARRIET BEECHER STOWE 1811–1896

Harriet Beecher Stowe was born in Connecticut into a prominent reform family. Her father was a Presbyterian minister and temperance advocate, Lyman Beecher. Her brother, Henry, was a clergyman and abolitionist.

Stowe moved with her family to Cincinnati, where the issue of slavery—once rather remote—became painfully familiar. She never forgot standing on the banks of the Ohio River, watching boats fill with slaves from Kentucky to be shipped to slave markets. Her hatred of slavery grew until she resolved to express herself in writing, and *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* resulted. The novel made such an impact that when Abraham Lincoln met Stowe a decade later, during the Civil War, he said, “So this is the little lady who made the big war.”

Tension in Kansas and Nebraska

Abolitionist feelings in the North further intensified when the issue of slavery in the territories—supposedly settled by the Compromise of 1850—surfaced once again. Ironically, Senator Stephen Douglas, who had helped to steer the compromise to victory, was the person most responsible for resurrecting the issue.
The Underground Railroad, 1850–1860

GEOGRAPHY SKILLBUILDER

1. **Movement** What does this map tell you about the routes of the Underground Railroad?

2. **Place** Name three cities that were destinations on the Underground Railroad.

3. **Location** Why do you think these cities were destinations?
**POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY** As early as 1844, Douglas was pushing to organize the huge territory west of Iowa and Missouri. In 1854, he developed a proposal to divide the area into two territories, Nebraska and Kansas. His motives were complicated. For one thing, Douglas was pushing for the construction of a railroad between Chicago—his hometown, where he also owned real estate—and San Francisco. To get this route, he had to make a deal with Southerners, who wanted the railroad to start in Memphis or New Orleans.

In addition, Douglas was anxious to organize the western territory because he believed that most of the nation’s people wished to see the western lands incorporated into the Union. Along with many other Democrats, Douglas was sure that continued expansion would strengthen his party and unify the nation. He also believed that popular sovereignty—that is, the right of residents of a given territory to vote on slavery for themselves—provided the most fair and democratic way to organize the new state governments. But what Douglas failed to fully understand was how strongly opposed to slavery Northerners had become.

To Douglas, popular sovereignty seemed like an excellent way to decide whether slavery would be allowed in the Nebraska Territory. The only difficulty was that Nebraska Territory lay north of the Missouri Compromise line of 36°30’ and therefore was legally closed to slavery. Douglas assumed, though, that the territory of Nebraska would enter the Union as two states, one free and one slave, and thus maintain the balance in the Senate between North and South.

Douglas was convinced that slavery could not exist on the open prairies, since none of the crops relying on slave labor could be grown there. However, to win over the South, Douglas decided to support repeal of the Missouri Compromise—which now would make slavery legal north of the 36°30’ line—though he predicted it would cause “a storm” in Congress. His prediction was right.

**THE KANSAS–NEBRASKA ACT**

On January 23, 1854, Douglas introduced a bill in Congress to divide the area into two territories: Nebraska in the north and Kansas in the south. If passed, it would repeal the Missouri Compromise and establish popular sovereignty for both territories. Congressional debate over the bill was bitter. Some Northern congressmen saw the bill as part of a plot to turn the territories into slave states; but nearly
90 percent of Southern congressmen voted for the bill. The bitterness spilled over into the general population, which deluged Congress with petitions both for and against the bill.

In the North, Douglas found himself ridiculed for betraying the Missouri Compromise. Yet he did not waver. He believed strongly that popular sovereignty was the democratic way to resolve the slavery issue.

**A Personal Voice  Stephen A. Douglas**

“If the people of Kansas want a slaveholding state, let them have it, and if they want a free state they have a right to it, and it is not for the people of Illinois, or Missouri, or New York, or Kentucky, to complain, whatever the decision of Kansas may be.”

—quoted in *The Civil War*, by Geoffrey C. Ward

With the help of President Franklin Pierce, a Democrat elected in 1852, Douglas steered his proposal through the Senate. After months of struggle and strife, the **Kansas-Nebraska Act** became law in May 1854. All eyes turned westward as the fate of the new territories hung in the balance.

## Violence Erupts in “Bleeding Kansas”

The race for the possession of Kansas was on. New York senator William Seward threw down the gauntlet: “Come on, then, gentlemen of the Slave States. . . . We will engage in competition for the virgin soil of Kansas and God give the victory to the side that is stronger in numbers as it is in right.”

From both the North and the South, settlers poured into the Kansas Territory. Some were simply farmers in search of new land. Most were sent by emigrant aid societies, groups formed specifically to supply rifles, animals, seed, and farm equipment to antislavery migrants.
By March 1855, Kansas had enough settlers to hold an election for a territorial legislature. However, thousands of "border ruffians" from the slave state of Missouri, led by Missouri senator David Atchison, crossed into Kansas with their revolvers cocked and voted illegally. They won a fraudulent majority for the proslavery candidates, who set up a government at Lecompton and promptly issued a series of proslavery acts. Furious over events in Lecompton, abolitionists organized a rival government in Topeka in fall 1855.

“The Sack of Lawrence” Before long, violence surfaced in the struggle for Kansas. Antislavery settlers had founded a town named Lawrence. A proslavery grand jury condemned Lawrence’s inhabitants as traitors and called on the local sheriff to arrest them. On May 21, 1856, a proslavery posse of 800 armed men swept into Lawrence to carry out the grand jury’s will. The posse burned down the antislavery headquarters, destroyed two newspapers’ printing presses, and looted many houses and stores. Abolitionist newspapers dubbed the event “the sack of Lawrence.”

“The Pottawatomie Massacre” The news from Lawrence soon reached John Brown, an abolitionist described by one historian as “a man made of the stuff of saints.” Brown believed that God had called on him to fight slavery. He also had the mistaken impression that the proslavery posse in Lawrence had killed five men. Brown was set on revenge. On May 24th, he and his followers pulled five men from their beds in the proslavery settlement of Pottawatomie Creek, hacked off their hands, and stabbed them with broadswords. This attack became famous as the “Pottawatomie Massacre” and quickly led to cries for revenge. It became the bloody shirt that proslavery Kansas settlers waved in summoning attacks on Free-Soilers.

The massacre triggered dozens of incidents throughout Kansas. Some 200 people were killed. John Brown fled Kansas but left behind men and women who lived with rifles by their sides. People began calling the territory Bleeding Kansas, as it had become a violent battlefield in a civil war.

Violence in the Senate Violence was not restricted to Kansas, however. On May 19, Massachusetts senator Charles Sumner delivered in the Senate an impassioned speech later called “The Crime Against Kansas.” For two days he verbally attacked his colleagues for their support of slavery. Sumner was particularly abusive toward the aged senator Andrew P. Butler of South Carolina, sneering at him for his proslavery beliefs and making fun of his impaired speech.

On May 22, Butler’s nephew, Congressman Preston S. Brooks, walked into the Senate chamber and over to Sumner’s desk. “I have read your speech twice over, carefully,” Brooks said softly. “It is a libel on South Carolina and Mr. Butler, who is a relative of mine.” With that, he lifted up his cane and struck Sumner on the head repeatedly before the cane broke. Sumner suffered shock and apparent brain damage and did not return to his Senate seat for over three years.

Southerners applauded and showered Brooks with new canes, including one inscribed with the words, “Hit him again!” Northerners condemned the incident as yet
The widening gulf between the North and the South had far-reaching implications for party politics as well. The compromises that had been tried from the time of the Wilmot Proviso until the Kansas-Nebraska Act could not satisfy either the North or the South. The tensions that resulted led to new political alliances as well as to violence. As the two sections grew further apart, the old national parties were torn apart and new political parties emerged.

Another example of Southern brutality and antagonism toward free speech. Northerners and Southerners, it appeared, had met an impasse.

The Union in Peril

This 1856 cartoon shows Preston Brooks attacking Charles Sumner in the U.S. Senate chamber.

MAIN IDEA

Summarizing

Describe Northern and Southern reactions to the incident between Brooks and Sumner.

1. TERMS & NAMES
   - Fugitive Slave Act
   - personal liberty laws
   - Underground Railroad
   - Harriet Tubman
   - Harriet Beecher Stowe
   - Uncle Tom’s Cabin
   - Kansas-Nebraska Act
   - John Brown
   - Bleeding Kansas

2. TAKING NOTES
   Create a time line highlighting the major events in the growing conflict between the North and the South. Use a form similar to the one below.

   event one   event three
   event two   event four

   Select one event. Explain how it was representative of North-South conflict.

3. ANALYZING EFFECTS
   Explain how Uncle Tom’s Cabin affected the abolitionist cause. Use details from the section to support your answer.

4. ANALYZING ISSUES
   Why was the Kansas-Nebraska Act so controversial? Use details from the section to support your answer.

5. SYNTHESIZING
   Explain the concept of popular sovereignty and describe Northern and Southern reactions to it as a way of making decisions about slavery in the territories. Use evidence from the text to support your answer. Think About:
   - Douglas’s view on continued expansion
   - Douglas and the Missouri Compromise
   - the congressional balance of power
The Birth of the Republican Party

In the mid-1850s, the issue of slavery and other factors split political parties and led to the birth of new ones. The Republican and Democratic parties remain the major political forces in the United States today.

As editor of the *New York Tribune*, Horace Greeley always spoke his mind. A staunch abolitionist, Greeley consistently argued in his columns against popular sovereignty and in favor of forcible resistance to slave catchers.

In March 1855, after Greeley became frustrated with the Whig Party’s shifting position on slavery, he issued a call to arms for “the friends of freedom” to “be girding up their loins for future contests” and join a new antislavery political party, the Republican Party.

**A Personal Voice**  
**Horace Greeley**

“...[The Republicans have] the heart, the conscience and the understanding of the people with them. ... All that is noble, all that is true, all that is pure, all that is manly, and estimable in human character, goes to swell the power of the anti-slavery party of the North. That party... now embraces every Northern man who does not want to see the government converted into a huge engine for the spread of slavery over the whole continent, every man... opposed to... the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill.”

—quoted in *The Coming of the Civil War*

Greeley’s appeal accurately reflected the changing national political scene. With the continuing tension over slavery, many Americans needed a national political voice. That voice was to be the Republican Party.

**New Political Parties Emerge**

By the end of 1856, the nation’s political landscape had shifted. The Whig Party had split over the issue of slavery, and the Democratic Party was weak. This left the new Republican Party to move within striking distance of the presidency.

**Slavery Divides Whigs**  
Divisions in the Whig Party widened in 1852 when General Winfield Scott became the Whig nominee for president. Scott owed his
Analyzing Causes
What impact did the slavery issue have on the Democratic and Whig parties?

NATIVISM

One alternative was the American Party which had its roots in a secret organization known as the Order of the Star-Spangled Banner. Members of this society believed in nativism, the favoring of native-born Americans over immigrants. Using secret handshakes and passwords, members were told to answer questions about their activities by saying, “I know nothing.” When nativists formed the American Party in 1854, it soon became better known as the Know-Nothing Party.

Primarily middle-class Protestants, nativists were dismayed not only at the total number of new immigrants but also at the number of Catholics among them. To nativists, the Catholic immigrants who had flooded into the country during the 1830s and 1840s were overly influenced by the Pope and could form a conspiracy to overthrow democracy.

While the Democratic Party courted immigrant voters, nativists voted for Know-Nothing candidates. The Know-Nothings split over the issue of slavery in the territories. Southern Know-Nothings looked for another alternative to the Democrats. Meanwhile, Northern Know-Nothings began to edge toward the Republican Party.

Antislavery Parties Form

Two forerunners of the Republican Party had emerged during the 1840s. In 1844 the tiny abolitionist Liberty Party—whose purpose was to pursue the cause of abolition by passing new laws—received only a small percentage of votes in the presidential election. Yet the Liberty Party won enough votes to throw the election to Democrat James K. Polk instead of Whig candidate Henry Clay.

In 1848 the Free-Soil Party, which opposed the extension of slavery into the territories, nominated former Democratic president Martin Van Buren. Although the Free-Soil Party failed to win any electoral votes in 1848, it received 10 percent of the popular vote, thus sending a clear message: even if some Northerners did not favor abolition, they definitely opposed the extension of slavery into the territories.

THE FREE-SOILERS

Many Northerners were Free-Soilers without being abolitionists. A number of Northern Free-Soilers supported laws prohibiting black settlement in their communities and denying blacks the right to vote. Free-Soilers objected to slavery’s impact on free white workers in the wage-based labor force, upon which the North depended. Abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison considered the Free-Soil Party “a sign of discontent with things political . . . reaching for something better. . . . It is a party for keeping Free Soil and not for setting men free.”
Free-Soilers detected a dangerous pattern in such events as the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. They were convinced that a conspiracy existed on the part of the “diabolical slave power” to spread slavery throughout the United States. Something or someone, according to the Free-Soilers, had to prevent this spread.

**REPUBLICAN PARTY** In February 1854, at a school house in Ripon, Wisconsin, some discontented Northern Whigs held a meeting with antislavery Democrats and Free-Soilers to form a new political party. On July 6, the new Republican Party was formally organized in Jackson, Michigan. Among its founders was Horace Greeley.

The Republican Party was united in opposing the Kansas-Nebraska Act and in keeping slavery out of the territories. Otherwise, it embraced a wide range of opinions. The conservative faction hoped to resurrect the Missouri Compromise. At the opposite extreme were some radical abolitionists. The Republican Party’s ability to draw support from such diverse groups provided the party with the strength to win a political tug of war with the other parties.

The main competition for the Republican Party was the Know-Nothing Party. Both parties targeted the same groups of voters. By 1855 the Republicans had set up party organizations in about half of the Northern states, but they lacked a national organization. Then, in quick succession, came the fraudulent territorial election in Kansas in March 1855, and the sack of Lawrence, the Pottawatomie massacre, and the caning of Sumner in 1856. Between “Bleeding Kansas” and “Bleeding Sumner,” the Republicans had the issues they needed in order to challenge the Democrats for the presidency in 1856.

**THE 1856 ELECTION** The Republicans chose John C. Frémont, the famed “Pathfinder” who had mapped the Oregon Trail and led U.S. troops into California during the war with Mexico, as their candidate in 1856. The Know-Nothings split their allegiance, with Northerners endorsing Frémont and Southerners selecting former U.S. president Millard Fillmore. Although Fillmore had once been a Whig, for all practical purposes, the Whigs had now dissolved.
The Democrats nominated James Buchanan of Pennsylvania. Although he was a Northerner, most of his Washington friends were Southerners. Furthermore, as minister to Great Britain he had been out of the country during the disputes over the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854. Thus, he had antagonized neither the North nor the South. Buchanan was the only truly national candidate. To balance support between the North and the South, the Democrats chose John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky as Buchanan’s running mate.

If Frémont had won, the South might well have seceded then and there. Judge P. J. Scruggs of Mississippi put it bluntly.

**A PERSONAL VOICE P. J. SCRUGGS**

“The election of Frémont would present, at once, to the people of the South, the question whether they would tamely crouch at the feet of their despoilers, or... openly defy their enemies, and assert their independence. In my judgment, anything short of immediate, prompt, and unhesitating secession, would be an act of servility that would seal our doom for all time to come.”

—quoted in *The Coming of the Civil War*

Buchanan, however, carried the day. Although he received only 45 percent of the popular vote, he won the entire South except for Maryland. Frémont, who carried 11 of the 16 free states, came in a strong second with 33 percent, while Fillmore brought up the rear with 22 percent.

The meaning was clear. First, the Democrats could win the presidency with a national candidate who could compete in the North without alienating Southerners. Second, the Know-Nothings were in decline. Third, the Republicans were a political force in the North.

The 1856 presidential campaign had been hard-fought. However, the dissonance that characterized party politics in the mid-1850s was only a pale preview of the turmoil that would divide the nation before the end of the decade.
States’ Rights

The power struggle between states and the federal government has caused controversy since the country’s beginning. At its worst, the conflict resulted in the Civil War. Today, state and federal governments continue to square off on jurisdictional issues.

- In 1996, the Supreme Court ruled that congressional districts in Texas and North Carolina that had been redrawn to increase minority representation were unconstitutional.
- In 2000, the Supreme Court agreed to hear another case in the ongoing—since 1979—dispute between the federal government and the state of Alaska over who has authority to lease offshore land for oil and gas drilling.

Constitutional conflicts between states’ rights and federal jurisdiction are pictured here. As you read, see how each issue was resolved.

1787

**CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION**

**ISSUE:** The Constitution tried to resolve the original debate over states’ rights versus federal authority.

At the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, delegates wanted to create a federal government that was stronger than the one created by the Articles of Confederation. But delegates disagreed about whether the federal government should have more power than the states. They also disagreed about whether large states should have more power than small states in the national legislature. The convention compromised—the Constitution reserves certain powers for the states, delegates other powers to the federal government, divides some powers between state and federal governments, and tries to balance the differing needs of the states through two houses of Congress.

1832

**NULLIFICATION**

**ISSUE:** The state of South Carolina moved to nullify, or declare void, a tariff set by Congress.

In the cartoon above, President Andrew Jackson, right, is playing a game called *bragg*. One of his opponents, Vice-President John C. Calhoun, is hiding two cards, “Nullification” and “Anti-Tariff,” behind him. Jackson is doing poorly in this game, but he eventually won the real nullification dispute. When Congress passed high tariffs on imports in 1832, politicians from South Carolina, led by Calhoun, tried to nullify the tariff law, or declare it void. Jackson threatened to enforce the law with federal troops. Congress reduced the tariff to avoid a confrontation, and Calhoun resigned the vice-presidency.
1957

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

ISSUE: Some Southern governors refused to obey federal desegregation mandates for schools.

In 1957, President Eisenhower mobilized federal troops in Little Rock, Arkansas, to enforce the Supreme Court’s 1954 ruling in the case of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka. This ruling made segregation in public schools illegal. The Arkansas National Guard escorted nine African-American students into Little Rock Central High School against the wishes of Governor Orval Faubus, who had tried to prevent the students from entering the school. After this incident, Faubus closed the high schools in Little Rock in 1958 and 1959, thereby avoiding desegregation.

1860

SOUTH CAROLINA’S SECESSION

ISSUE: The conflict over a state’s right to secede, or withdraw, from the Union led to the Civil War.

In December 1860, Southern secessionists cheered “secession” enthusiastically in front of the Mills House (left), a hotel in Charleston, South Carolina. South Carolina seceded after the election of Abraham Lincoln, whom the South perceived as anti-states’ rights and antislavery. Lincoln took the position that states did not have the right to secede from the Union. In 1861, he ordered that provisions be sent to the federal troops stationed at Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor. South Carolinians fired on the fort—and the Civil War was under way. The Union’s victory in the war ended the most serious challenge to federal authority: states did not have the right to secede from the Union.

THINKING CRITUICALLY

CONNECT TO HISTORY

1. Creating a Chart For each incident pictured, create a chart that tells who was on each side of the issue, summarizes each position, and explains how the issue was resolved.

CONNECT TO TODAY

2. Using Primary and Secondary Sources Research one of the controversies in the bulleted list in the opening paragraph or another states’ rights controversy of the 1990s or 2000s. Decide which side you support. Write a paragraph explaining your position on the issue.

hmhsocialstudies.com RESEARCH WEB LINKS
On June 16, 1858, the Republican Party of Illinois nominated its state chairman, Abraham Lincoln, to run for the U.S. Senate against Democratic incumbent Stephen A. Douglas. That night Lincoln launched his campaign with a ringing address to the convention. It included a biblical quotation.

**A PERSONAL VOICE ABRAHAM LINCOLN**

“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. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it... or its advocates will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.”

—1858 speech

Lincoln was correct in that the United States could not survive for long with such a deep gulf between the North and the South—but was he right that the Union would not dissolve? With a weak president in James Buchanan and new legal questions over slavery, the United States faced the future with apprehension. Some suspected that events would lead like a trail of powder to a final explosion.

**Slavery Dominates Politics**

For strong leaders, slavery was a difficult issue. But it presented even more of a challenge for the indecisive President Buchanan, whose administration was plagued by slavery-related controversies. The first one arose on March 6, 1857.
DRED SCOTT DECISION  In 1856 an important legal question came before the Supreme Court. The case concerned Dred Scott, a slave from Missouri. Scott’s owner had taken him north of the Missouri Compromise line in 1834. For four years they had lived in free territory in Illinois and Wisconsin. Later they returned to Missouri, where Scott’s owner died. Scott then began a lawsuit to gain his freedom. He claimed that he had become a free person by living in free territory for several years.

On March 6, 1857, Supreme Court Chief Justice Roger B. Taney handed down the decision. (See Dred Scott v. Sandford, page 332.) The Court ruled that slaves did not have the rights of citizens. Furthermore, said the court, Dred Scott had no claim to freedom, because he had been living in Missouri, a slave state, when he began his suit. Finally, the Court ruled that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional. Congress could not forbid slavery in any part of the territories. Doing so would interfere with slaveholders’ right to own property, a right protected by the Fifth Amendment.

Sectional passions exploded immediately. Southerners cheered the Court’s decision. Northerners were stunned. By striking down the Missouri Compromise, the Supreme Court had cleared the way for the extension of slavery. Opponents of slavery now pinned their hopes on the Republican Party. If the Republicans became strong enough, they could still keep slavery in check.

THE LECOMPTON CONSTITUTION  In fall 1857, the proslavery government at Lecompton, Kansas, wrote a constitution and applied for admission to the Union. Free-Soilers—who by this time outnumbered proslavery settlers in Kansas by nearly ten to one—rejected the proposed constitution because it protected the rights of slaveholders. The legislature called for a referendum in which the people could vote on the proslavery constitution. They voted against it.

At this point President Buchanan made a poor decision: he endorsed the proslavery Lecompton constitution. He owed his presidency to Southern support and believed that since Kansas contained only about 200 slaves, the Free-Soilers were overreacting.

Buchanan’s endorsement provoked the wrath of Illinois Democrat Stephen A. Douglas, who did not care “whether [slavery] is voted down or voted up.” What he cared about was popular sovereignty. Backed by an antislavery coalition of Republicans and Northern Democrats, Douglas persuaded Congress to authorize another referendum on the constitution. In summer 1858, voters rejected the constitution once again. Northerners hailed Douglas as a hero, Southerners scorned him as a traitor, and the two wings of the Democratic Party moved still farther apart.

Lincoln-Douglas Debates

That summer witnessed the start of one of Illinois’s greatest political contests: the 1858 race for the U.S. Senate between Democratic incumbent Douglas and Republican challenger Abraham Lincoln. To many outsiders, it must have seemed like an uneven match. Douglas was a two-term senator with an outstanding record and a large campaign chest. Who was Lincoln?
A self-educated man with a dry wit, Lincoln was known locally as a successful lawyer and politician. Elected as a Whig to one term in Congress in 1846, he broke with his party after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 and became a Republican two years later.

**LINCOLN CHALLENGES DOUGLAS** As the senatorial campaign progressed, the Republican Party decided that Lincoln needed to counteract the “Little Giant’s” well-known name and extensive financial resources. As a result, Lincoln challenged Douglas to a series of seven open-air debates to be held throughout Illinois on the issue of slavery in the territories. Douglas accepted the challenge, and the stage was set for some of the most celebrated debates in U.S. history.

Lincoln and Douglas had very different speaking styles. Douglas exuded self-confidence, pacing back and forth on the stage and dramatically using his fists to pound home his points. Lincoln, on the other hand, delivered his comments solemnly, using direct and plain language.

**POSITIONS AND ARGUMENTS** The two men’s positions were simple and consistent. Douglas believed deeply in popular sovereignty, in allowing the residents of a territory to vote for or against slavery. Although he did not think that slavery was immoral, he did believe that it was a backward labor system unsuitable to prairie agriculture. The people, Douglas figured, understood this and would vote Kansas and Nebraska free. However, Lincoln, like many Free-Soilers, believed that slavery was immoral—a labor system based on greed.

The crucial difference between the two was that Douglas believed that popular sovereignty would allow slavery to pass away on its own, while Lincoln doubted that slavery would cease to spread without legislation outlawing it in the territories.

In the course of the debates, each candidate tried to distort the views of the other. Lincoln tried to make Douglas look like a defender of slavery and of the *Dred Scott* decision. In turn, Douglas accused Lincoln of being an abolitionist and an advocate of racial equality. Lincoln responded by saying, “I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races.” He did, however, insist that slavery was a moral, social, and political wrong that should not be allowed to spread.

**THE FREEPORT DOCTRINE** In their second debate, held at Freeport, Lincoln asked his opponent a crucial question. Could the settlers of a territory vote to exclude slavery before the territory became a state? Everyone knew that the *Dred Scott* decision said no—that territories could not exclude slavery. Popular sovereignty, Lincoln implied, was thus an empty phrase.

Douglas’s response to Lincoln’s question became later known as the Freeport Doctrine. Douglas contended, “Slavery cannot exist a day or an hour
anywhere, unless it is supported by local police regulations.” If the people of a territory were Free-Soilers, he explained, then all they had to do was elect representatives who would not enforce slave property laws. In other words, regardless of theory or the Supreme Court’s ruling, people could get around the *Dred Scott* decision.

Douglas won the Senate seat, but his response had worsened the split between the Northern and Southern wings of the Democratic Party. As for Lincoln, his attacks on the “vast moral evil” of slavery drew national attention, and some Republicans began thinking of him as an excellent candidate for the presidency in 1860.

**Passions Ignite**

If 1858 was a year of talk, then 1859 turned out to be a year of action. Most Americans probably would have welcomed a respite from the issue of slavery. Instead, “God’s angry man,” John Brown, reemerged on the scene and ended all hopes of a compromise over slavery between the North and the South.

**HARPERS FERRY** While politicians debated the slavery issue, John Brown was studying the slave uprisings that had occurred in ancient Rome and on the French island of Haiti. He believed that the time was ripe for similar uprisings in the United States. Brown secretly obtained financial backing from several prominent Northern abolitionists. On the night of October 16, 1859, he led a band of 21 men, black and white, into Harpers Ferry, Virginia (now West Virginia). His aim was to seize the federal arsenal there, distribute the captured arms to slaves in the area, and start a general slave uprising.

Sixty of the town’s prominent citizens were held hostage by Brown who hoped that their slaves would then join the insurrection. No slaves came forward. Instead, local troops killed eight of Brown’s men. Then a detachment of U.S. Marines, commanded by Colonel Robert E. Lee, raced to Harpers Ferry, stormed the engine house where Brown and his men had barricaded themselves, killed two more of the raiders, and captured Brown. Brown was then turned over to Virginia to be tried for treason.

Historians have long debated Brown’s actions. There is no doubt that he hated slavery with all his heart. However, why did he fail to tell slaves in the area about his plans beforehand? Why didn’t he provide his men with enough food to last for even one day? In any case, Brown certainly hoped that his actions would arouse Northern fury and start a war for abolition.

**JOHN BROWN’S HANGING** On December 2, 1859, Brown was hanged for high treason in the presence of federal troops and a crowd of curious observers. Public reaction was immediate and intense. Although Lincoln and Douglas condemned Brown as a murderer, many other Northerners expressed admiration for him and for his cause. Bells tolled at the news of his execution, guns fired salutes, and huge crowds gathered to hear fiery speakers denounce the South. Some Northerners began to call Brown a martyr for the sacred cause of freedom.
The response was equally extreme in the South, where outraged mobs assaulted whites who were suspected of holding antislavery views. Harpers Ferry terrified Southern slaveholders, who were convinced the North was plotting slave uprisings everywhere. Even longtime supporters of the Union called for secession. As one former Unionist explained, “I am willing to take the chances of . . . disunion, sooner than submit any longer to Northern insolence and Northern outrage.”

**Lincoln Is Elected President**

Despite the tide of hostility that now flowed between North and South, the Republican Party eagerly awaited its presidential convention in May 1860. When the convention began, almost everyone believed that the party’s candidate would be Senator William H. Seward of New York. However, events took a dramatic turn.

**THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION** The convention took place in Chicago, which had quickly transformed itself into a convention city with more than 50 hotels and an 18,000-square-foot wooden meeting center named the Wigwam. Republicans flooded into the frontier city in such crowds that despite the preparations, many ended up sleeping on pool tables in the hotels.

The convention opened to a surging crowd of delegates, newsmen, and spectators. The 4,500-person delegate floor overflowed within minutes. To gain seating in the galleries, which were reserved for gentlemen who had come with ladies, determined single men even offered schoolgirls a quarter for their company. The first day of the convention was passed in forming committees, listening to prayers, and gossiping about politics. As events came to a close, campaign managers for the candidates retreated to their headquarters and began bargaining for delegates’ votes, some working late into the night.
SEWARD AND LINCOLN  Senator William H. Seward appeared to have everything one needed in order to be a successful presidential candidate: the credential of having led anti-slavery forces in Congress, the financial support of New York political organizations—and a desire to be the center of attention. In fact, Seward himself had little doubt that he would be nominated. Well before the voting took place, Seward drafted his senatorial resignation speech, which he planned to deliver when his nomination became official.

Seward’s well-known name and his reputation may have worked against him, however. Abraham Lincoln’s being relatively unknown probably won him the nomination. Unlike Seward, Lincoln had not had much chance to offend his fellow Republicans. The delegates rejected Seward and his talk of an “irrepressible conflict” between North and South. On the third ballot, they nominated Lincoln, who seemed more moderate in his views. Although Lincoln pledged to halt the further spread of slavery “as with a chain of steel,” he also tried to reassure Southerners that a Republican administration would not “directly, or indirectly, interfere with their slaves, or with them, about their slaves.” His reassurances fell on deaf ears. In Southern eyes, he was a “black Republican,” whose election would be “the greatest evil that has ever befallen this country.”

THE ELECTION OF 1860  Three major candidates vied for office in addition to Lincoln. The Democratic Party split over the issue of slavery. Northern Democrats backed Stephen Douglas and his doctrine of popular sovereignty. Southern Democrats backed Vice-President John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky. Former Know-Nothings and Whigs from the South, along with some moderate Northerners, organized the Constitutional Union Party, which ignored the issue of slavery altogether. They nominated John Bell of Tennessee.

“A POLITICAL RACE”  This cartoon depicts the major candidates in the 1860 presidential election. Three of the candidates, Bell, Breckinridge, and Douglas, are in hot pursuit of the front runner—Republican Abraham Lincoln. It was a close race. Lincoln defeated Douglas in the North. Breckinridge carried most of the South. Because the North had a higher population than the South, Lincoln won the election.

SKILLBUILDER  Analyzing Political Cartoons  
1. Who, in the opinion of the artist, is the fittest man in the race? 
2. How does this cartoon suggest the course of the election of 1860?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R24.
Lincoln emerged as the winner, but like Buchanan in the previous election, he received less than half the popular vote. In fact, although Lincoln defeated his combined opponents in the electoral vote by 180 to 123, he received no electoral votes from the South. Unlike Buchanan, Lincoln had sectional rather than national support, carrying every free state but not even appearing on the ballot in most of the slave states. The outlook for the Union was grim.

Southern Secession

Lincoln’s victory convinced Southerners that they had lost their political voice in the national government. Fearful that Northern Republicans would submit the South to what noted Virginia agriculturist Edmund Ruffin called “the most complete subjection and political bondage,” some Southern states decided to act. South Carolina led the way, seceding from the Union on December 20, 1860. Four days later, the news reached William Tecumseh Sherman, superintendent of the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy. In utter dismay, Sherman poured out his fears for the South.

**A PERSONAL VOICE WILLIAM TECUMSEH SHERMAN**

“This country will be drenched in blood. . . . [T]he people of the North. . . . are not going to let the country be destroyed without a mighty effort to save it. Besides, where are your men and appliances of war to contend against them? . . . You are rushing into war with one of the most powerful, ingeniously mechanical and determined people on earth—right at your doors. . . . Only in spirit and determination are you prepared for war. In all else you are totally unprepared.”

——quoted in None Died in Vain

Even Sherman underestimated the depth and intensity of the South’s commitment. For many Southern planters, the cry of “States’ rights!” meant the complete independence of Southern states from federal government control. Most white Southerners also feared that an end to their entire way of life was at hand. Many were desperate for one last chance to preserve the slave labor system and saw secession as the only way. Mississippi followed South Carolina’s lead and seceded on January 9, 1861. Florida seceded the next day. Within a few weeks, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas had also seceded.

**THE SHAPING OF THE CONFEDERACY** On February 4, 1861, delegates from the secessionist states met in Montgomery, Alabama, where they formed the Confederacy, or Confederate States of America. The Confederate constitution closely resembled that of the United States. The most notable difference was that the Confederate constitution “protected and recognized” slavery in new
territories. The new constitution also stressed that each state was to be “sovereign and independent,” a provision that would hamper efforts to unify the South.

On February 9, delegates to the Confederate constitutional convention unanimously elected former senator Jefferson Davis of Mississippi as president and Alexander Stephens of Georgia as vice-president. Davis had made his position clear, noting that to present a show of strength to the North, the South should “offer no doubtful or divided front.” At his inauguration, Davis declared, “The time for compromise has now passed.” His listeners responded by singing “Farewell to the Star-Spangled Banner” and “Dixie.”

**THE CALM BEFORE THE STORM** As the nation awaited Lincoln’s inauguration in March, its citizens were confused. What would happen now? Seven slave states had seceded and formed a new nation. Eight slave states remained within the Union. Would they secede also?

President Buchanan was uncertain. He announced that secession was illegal, but that it also would be illegal for him to do anything about it. He tied his own hands, but in truth there was not much that he could have done.

One problem was that Washington, D.C. was very much a Southern city. There were secessionists in Congress and in all of the departments of the federal government, as well as in the president’s cabinet. Consequently, mass resignations took place. To some people it seemed as if the federal government were melting away. One key question remained in everyone’s mind: Would the North allow the South to leave the Union without a fight?

### MAIN IDEA

**2. TAKING NOTES**

List six major events described in this section and explain how each one sharpened the North-South conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRITICAL THINKING

**3. CONTRASTING**

How did Lincoln and Douglas disagree about slavery? Which of their views were facts, and which were opinions?

**4. EVALUATING**

If you had been voting in the presidential election of 1860, for whom would you have voted, other than Abraham Lincoln? Explain your reasoning by using specific references to the chapter.

**5. ANALYZING PRIMARY SOURCES**

In *Dred Scott v. Sandford* of 1857, the Supreme Court found that:

> “A free negro of the African race, whose ancestors were brought to this country and sold as slaves, is not a "citizen" within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States.”

How did the Supreme Court decision add to the tensions over slavery in the 1850s?
**DRED SCOTT v. SANFORD (1857)**

**ORIGINS OF THE CASE** Dred Scott’s slave master had brought him from the slave state of Missouri to live for a time in free territory and in the free state of Illinois. Eventually they returned to Missouri. Scott believed that because he had lived in free territory, he should be free. In 1854 he sued in federal court for his freedom. The court ruled against him, and he appealed to the Supreme Court.

**THE RULING** The Supreme Court ruled that African Americans were not and could never be citizens. Thus, Dred Scott had no right even to file a lawsuit and remained enslaved.

**LEGAL REASONING**

The Court’s decision, based primarily on Chief Justice Roger Taney’s written opinion, made two key findings. First, it held that because Scott was a slave, he was not a citizen and had no right to sue in a United States court.

“We think they [slaves] . . . are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word ‘citizens’ in the Constitution, and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States.”

This could have been the end of the matter, but Taney went further. He said that by banning slavery, Congress was, in effect, taking away property. Such an action, he wrote, violated the Fifth Amendment, which guarantees the right not to be deprived of property without due process of law (such as a hearing). Thus, all congressional efforts to ban slavery in the territories were prohibited.

Justices John McLean and Benjamin Curtis strongly dissented on both points. They showed that the U.S. Constitution, state constitutions, and other laws had recognized African Americans as citizens. They also pointed to the clause in the Constitution giving Congress the power to “make all needful Rules and Regulations” to govern U.S. territories. In their view, this clause gave Congress the power to prohibit slavery in the territories.

**U.S. CONSTITUTION**

**U.S. CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 4, SECTION 2 (1789)**

“No Person held to Service or Labor in one State, . . . escaping into another, shall, in Consequence of any Law or Regulation therein, be discharged from such Service or Labor. . . .”

**U.S. CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 4, SECTION 3 (1789)**

“The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . .”

**U.S. CONSTITUTION, FIFTH AMENDMENT (1791)**

“No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. . . .”

**RELATED CASES**

**ABLEMAN v. BOOTH (1858)**

The Court decided that the Fugitive Slave Act was constitutional and that laws passed in Northern states that prohibited the return of fugitive slaves were unconstitutional.
WHY IT MATTERED

Taney’s opinion in *Dred Scott* had far-reaching consequences. Legally, the opinion greatly expanded the reach of slavery. Politically, it heightened the sectional tensions that would lead to the Civil War.

Before the Court decided *Dred Scott*, Americans widely accepted the idea that Congress and the states could limit slavery. As the dissenter argued, many previous acts of Congress had limited slavery—for example, the Northwest Ordinance had banned slavery in the Northwest Territory—and no one had claimed that those acts violated property rights.

Taney’s opinion in *Dred Scott*, however, was a major change. This expansion of slaveholders’ rights cast doubt on whether free states could prevent slave owners from bringing or even selling slaves into free areas.

As a result, *Dred Scott* intensified the slavery debate as no single event had before. In going beyond what was needed to settle the case before him, Taney’s ruling became a political act, and threw into question the legitimacy of the Court. Further, Taney’s opinion took the extreme proslavery position and installed it as the national law. It not only negated all the compromises made to date by pro- and anti-slavery forces, but it seemed to preclude any possible future compromises.

HISTORICAL IMPACT

It took four years of bitter civil war to find out if Taney’s opinion would stand as the law of the land. It would not. Immediately after the Civil War, the federal government moved to abolish slavery with the Thirteenth Amendment (1865) and then to extend state and national citizenship with the Fourteenth Amendment (1868) to “[a]ll persons born or naturalized in the United States.” The wording of these amendments was expressly intended to nullify *Dred Scott*.

These amendments meant that *Dred Scott* would no longer be used as a precedent—an earlier ruling that can be used to justify a current one. Instead, it is now pointed to as an important lesson on the limits of the Supreme Court’s power, as a key step on the road to the Civil War, and as one of the worst decisions ever made by the Supreme Court.

THINKING CRITICALLY

CONNECT TO HISTORY

1. Developing Historical Perspective Use the library to find commentaries on *Dred Scott* written at the time the decision was made. Read two of these commentaries and identify which section—North or South—the writer or speaker came from. Explain how each person’s region shaped his or her views.

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R11.

CONNECT TO TODAY

2. Visit the links for Historic Decisions of the Supreme Court to research what it means to be a citizen of the United States and what rights that citizenship extends. Research which constitutional amendments, U.S. laws, and Supreme Court decisions guarantee the rights of citizens. Prepare an oral presentation or annotated display to summarize your findings.

hmhsocialstudies.com INTERNET ACTIVITY
TERMS & NAMES
For each term below, write a sentence explaining its connection to the growing conflict in the 1850s.

1. secession
2. Compromise of 1850
3. popular sovereignty
4. Stephen A. Douglas
5. Fugitive Slave Act
6. Harriet Tubman
7. nativism
8. Horace Greeley
9. John Brown
10. Dred Scott

MAIN IDEAS
Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

The Divisive Politics of Slavery (pages 304–309)
1. Describe the economic differences between the North and the South in the 1850s.
2. What were the major terms of the Compromise of 1850?

Protest, Resistance, and Violence (pages 310–317)
3. Discuss the impacts Harriet Tubman and Harriet Beecher Stowe had on antislavery attitudes in the North.
4. What were the basic provisions and results of the Kansas-Nebraska Act?

The Birth of the Republican Party (pages 318–321)
5. Why did the Republican Party grow as the Whig and Know-Nothing parties declined in the 1850s?
6. Summarize the results of the election of 1856.

Slavery and Secession (pages 324–331)
7. Compare and contrast Abraham Lincoln’s and Stephen A. Douglas’s views about slavery in the territories.
8. Why was the South so upset by Lincoln’s election?

CRITICAL THINKING

1. USING YOUR NOTES In a chart like the one shown, explain how the following key events led to secession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY EVENT</th>
<th>FUEL FOR SECESSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilmot Proviso of 1846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise of 1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election of 1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. DRAWING CONCLUSIONS John Brown, Harriet Tubman, and Harriet Beecher Stowe all opposed slavery. Explain whether you consider any of these people to be heroes. Defend your viewpoint with references from the chapter.

3. INTERPRETING MAPS Review the map on page 313. Think about the terrain and bodies of water that an escaping slave would have faced. In what ways might these physical features have helped or hindered a fugitive’s progress?
1. Which of the following statements is not supported by the pie charts?

A. The South was at a disadvantage in population.
B. The South had no advantages over the North.
C. The North held an advantage in the value of manufactured goods.
D. The North and South had unequal resources.

2. Why might an abolitionist in the 1850s have been eager to support de Tocqueville’s point of view?

F. to publicize the virtues of Ohio
G. to persuade people to settle in Kansas
H. to argue that slavery was bad for slave and master
J. to show that immigrants don’t understand American traditions

3. The Wilmot Proviso failed to pass in the Senate because —

A. Northerners controlled the Senate.
B. Southerners controlled the Senate.
C. California was against it.
D. Mexico was in support of it.

For additional test practice, go online for:
- Diagnostic tests
- Tutorials
**Essential Question**

What were the strategies, outcomes, and legacies of the Civil War?

**What You Will Learn**

In this chapter you will learn about the Civil War that divided the United States in the 1860s.

**SECTION 1: The Civil War Begins**

- **Main Idea** The secession of Southern states caused the North and the South to take up arms.

**SECTION 2: The Politics of War**

- **Main Idea** By issuing the Emancipation Proclamation, President Lincoln made slavery the focus of the war.

**SECTION 3: Life During Wartime**

- **Main Idea** The Civil War brought about dramatic social and economic changes in American society.

**SECTION 4: The North Takes Charge**

- **Main Idea** Key victories at Vicksburg and Gettysburg helped the Union wear down the Confederacy.

**SECTION 5: The Legacy of the War**

- **Main Idea** The Civil War settled longstanding disputes over states’ rights and slavery.

---

**USA**

- 1861
  - Inauguration of President Lincoln
  - Fort Sumter is taken by the Confederates.

- 1862
  - North and South clash at Shiloh.

- 1863

**WORLD**

- 1861
  - Victor Emmanuel II proclaims an independent Kingdom of Italy.
  - Alexander II emancipates the Russian serfs.

- 1862
  - Otto von Bismarck is named prime minister of Prussia.

- 1863
  - President Lincoln issues the Emancipation Proclamation.
  - The Union wins at Gettysburg and Vicksburg.
The year is 1861. Seven Southern states have seceded from the Union over the issues of slavery and states’ rights. They have formed their own government, called the Confederacy, and raised an army. In March, the Confederate army attacks and seizes Fort Sumter, a Union stronghold in South Carolina. President Lincoln responds by issuing a call for volunteers to serve in the Union army.

**Explore the Issues**
- Can diplomacy prevent a war between the states?
- What makes a civil war different from a foreign war?
- How might a civil war affect society and the U.S. economy?
On April 18, 1861, the federal supply ship *Baltic* dropped anchor off the coast of New Jersey. Aboard was Major Robert Anderson, a 35-year army veteran on his way from Charleston, South Carolina, to New York City. That day, Anderson wrote out a report to the secretary of war, describing his most recent command.

**A Personal Voice**

ROBERT ANDERSON

“Having defended Fort Sumter for thirty-four hours, until the quarters were entirely burned, the main gates destroyed by fire, . . . the magazine surrounded by flames, . . . four barrels and three cartridges of powder only being available, and no provisions but pork remaining, I accepted terms of evacuation . . . and marched out of the fort . . . with colors flying and drums beating . . . and saluting my flag with fifty guns.”

—quoted in *Fifty Basic Civil War Documents*

The flag that Major Anderson saluted was the Stars and Stripes. After it came down, the Confederates raised their own flag, the Stars and Bars. The confederate attack on Fort Sumter signaled the start of the Civil War.

**Confederates Fire on Fort Sumter**

The seven southernmost states that had already seceded formed the Confederate States of America on February 4, 1861. Confederate soldiers immediately began taking over federal installations in their states—courthouses, post offices, and especially forts. By the time of Abraham Lincoln’s inauguration on March 4, only two Southern forts remained in Union hands. The more important was South Carolina’s *Fort Sumter*, on an island in Charleston harbor.
The day after his inauguration, the new president received an urgent dispatch from the fort’s commander, Major Anderson. The Confederacy was demanding that he surrender or face an attack, and his supplies of food and ammunition would last six weeks at the most.

**LINCOLN’S DILEMMA** The news presented Lincoln with a dilemma. If he ordered the navy to shoot its way into Charleston harbor and reinforce Fort Sumter, he would be responsible for starting hostilities, which might prompt the slave states still in the Union to secede. If he ordered the fort evacuated, he would be treating the Confederacy as a legitimate nation. Such an action would anger the Republican Party, weaken his administration, and endanger the Union.

**FIRST SHOTS** Lincoln executed a clever political maneuver. He would not abandon Fort Sumter, but neither would he reinforce it. He would merely send in “food for hungry men.”

Now it was Jefferson Davis who faced a dilemma. If he did nothing, he would damage the image of the Confederacy as a sovereign, independent nation. On the other hand, if he ordered an attack on Fort Sumter, he would turn peaceful secession into war. Davis chose war. At 4:30 A.M. on April 12, Confederate batteries began thundering away. Charleston’s citizens watched and cheered as though it were a fireworks display. The South Carolinians bombarded the fort with more than 4,000 rounds before Anderson surrendered.

**VIRGINIA SECEDES** News of Fort Sumter’s fall united the North. When Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers to serve for three months, the response was overwhelming. In Iowa, 20 times the state’s quota rushed to enlist.

Lincoln’s call for troops provoked a very different reaction in the states of the upper South. On April 17, Virginia, unwilling to fight against other Southern states, seceded—a terrible loss to the Union. Virginia was the most heavily populated state in the South and the most industrialized (with a crucial ironworks and navy yard). In May, Arkansas, Tennessee, and North Carolina followed Virginia, bringing the number of Confederate states to 11. However, the western counties of Virginia were antislavery, so they seceded from Virginia and were admitted into the Union as West Virginia in 1863. The four remaining slave states—Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, and Missouri—remained in the Union, although many of the citizens in those states fought for the Confederacy.

**SKILLBUILDER** Interpreting Graphs

1. Which side—North or South—had the advantage in terms of industrial production?
2. What do the overall data suggest about the eventual outcome of the war?
Americans Expect a Short War

Northerners and Confederates alike expected a short, glorious war. Soldiers left for the front with bands playing and crowds cheering. Both sides felt that right was on their side.

**UNION AND CONFEDERATE STRATEGIES** In reality the two sides were unevenly matched. The Union enjoyed enormous advantages in resources over the South—more fighting power, more factories, greater food production, and a more extensive railroad system. In addition, Lincoln proved to be a decisive yet patient leader, skillful at balancing political factions.

The Confederacy likewise enjoyed some advantages, notably “King Cotton” (and the profits it earned on the world market), first-rate generals, a strong military tradition, and soldiers who were highly motivated because they were defending their homeland. However, the South had a tradition of local and limited government, and there was resistance to the centralization of government necessary to run a war. Several Southern governors were so obstinate in their assertion of states’ rights that they refused to cooperate with the Confederate government.

The two sides pursued different military strategies. The Union, which had to conquer the South to win, devised a three-part plan: (1) the Union navy would blockade Southern ports, so they could neither export cotton nor import much-needed manufactured goods, (2) Union riverboats and armies would move down the Mississippi River and split the Confederacy in two, and (3) Union armies would capture the Confederate capital at Richmond, Virginia.

**GEOGRAPHY SKILLBUILDER**

1. **Region** In which region of the country did Northern forces have the most success?
2. **Place** In which states did Confederate troops attempt invasions of the North?
Northern newspapers dubbed the strategy the **Anaconda plan**, after a snake that suffocates its victims in its coils. Because the Confederacy’s goal was its own survival as a nation, its strategy was mostly defensive. However, Southern leaders encouraged their generals to attack—and even to invade the North—if the opportunity arose.

**BULL RUN** The first major bloodshed occurred on July 21, about three months after Fort Sumter fell. An army of 30,000 inexperienced Union soldiers on its way toward the Confederate capital at Richmond, only 100 miles from Washington, D.C., came upon an equally inexperienced Confederate army encamped near the little creek of **Bull Run**, just 25 miles from the Union capital. Lincoln commanded General Irvin McDowell to attack, noting, “You are green, it is true, but they are green also.”

The battle was a seesaw affair. In the morning the Union army gained the upper hand, but the Confederates held firm, inspired by General Thomas J. Jackson. “There is Jackson standing like a stone wall!” another general shouted, originating the nickname **Stonewall Jackson**. In the afternoon Confederate reinforcements arrived and turned the tide of battle into the first victory for the South. The routed Union troops began a panicky retreat to the capital.
A newspaper reporter described the chaos at the scene.

**A PERSONAL VOICE**

“...I saw officers ...—majors and colonels who had deserted their commands—pass me galloping as if for dear life... For three miles, hosts of Federal troops ...all mingled in one disorderly rout. Wounded men lying along the banks ...appealed with raised hands to those who rode horses, begging to be lifted behind, but few regarded such petitions.”

—correspondent, New York World, July 21, 1861

Fortunately for the Union, the Confederates were too exhausted and disorganized to attack Washington. Still, Confederate morale soared. Bull Run “has secured our independence,” declared a Georgia secessionist, and many Southern soldiers, confident that the war was over, left the army and went home.

**Union Armies in the West**

Lincoln responded to the defeat at Bull Run by calling for the enlistment of 500,000 men to serve for three years instead of three months. Three days later, he called for an additional 500,000 men. He also appointed General George McClellan to lead this new Union army, encamped near Washington. While McClellan drilled his men—soon to be known as the Army of the Potomac—the Union forces in the West began the fight for control of the Mississippi.

**FORTS HENRY AND DONELSON** In February 1862 a Union army invaded western Tennessee. At its head was General Ulysses S. Grant, a rumpled West Point graduate who had failed at everything he had tried in civilian life—whether as farmer, bill collector, real estate agent, or store clerk. He was, however, a brave, tough, and decisive military commander.

In just 11 days, Grant’s forces captured two Confederate forts that held strategic positions on important rivers, Fort Henry on the Tennessee River and Fort Donelson on the Cumberland River. In the latter victory, Grant informed the Southern commander that “no terms except unconditional and immediate surrender can be accepted.” The Confederates surrendered and, from then on, people said that Grant’s initials stood for “Unconditional Surrender” Grant.

**SHILOH** One month after the victories at Fort Henry and Fort Donelson, in late March of 1862, Grant gathered his troops near a small Tennessee church named Shiloh, which was close to the Mississippi border. On April 6 thousands of yelling Confederate soldiers surprised the Union forces. Many Union troops were shot while making coffee; some died while they were still lying in their blankets. With Union forces on the edge of disaster, Grant reorganized his troops, ordered up reinforcements, and counterattacked at dawn the following day. By midafternoon the Confederate forces were in retreat. The Battle of Shiloh taught both sides a strategic lesson. Generals now realized that they had to send out scouts, dig trenches, and build fortifications. Shiloh also demonstrated how bloody the war might become, as nearly one-fourth of the battle’s 100,000 troops were killed, wounded, or captured. Although the battle seemed to be a draw, it had a long-range impact on the war. The Confederate failure to hold on to its Ohio-Kentucky frontier showed that at least part of the Union’s three-way strategy, the drive to take the Mississippi and split the Confederacy, might succeed.
As Grant pushed toward the Mississippi River, a Union fleet of about 40 ships approached the river’s mouth in Louisiana. Its commander was sixty-year-old David G. Farragut; its assignment, to seize New Orleans, the Confederacy’s largest city and busiest port.

On April 24, Farragut ran his fleet past two Confederate forts in spite of booming enemy guns and fire rafts heaped with burning pitch. Five days later, the U.S. flag flew over New Orleans. During the next two months, Farragut took control of Baton Rouge and Natchez. If the Union captured all the major cities along the lower Mississippi, then Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Tennessee would be cut off. Only Port Hudson, Louisiana, and Vicksburg, Mississippi, perched high on a bluff above the river, still stood in the way.

**A Revolution in Warfare**

Instrumental in the successes of Grant and Farragut in the West was a new type of war machine: the ironclad ship. This and other advances in technology changed military strategy and contributed to the war’s high casualty rate.

**IRONCLADS** The ironclad ship could splinter wooden ships, withstand cannon fire, and resist burning. Grant used four ironclad ships when he captured Forts Henry and Donelson. On March 9, 1862, two ironclads, the North’s Monitor and the South’s Merrimack (renamed by the South as the Virginia) fought an historic duel.

A Union steam frigate, the Merrimack, had sunk off the coast of Virginia in 1861. The Confederates recovered the ship, and Confederate secretary of the navy Stephen R. Mallory put engineers to work plating it with iron. When Union secretary of the navy Gideon Welles heard of this development, he was determined to respond in kind. Naval engineer John Ericsson designed a ship, the Monitor, that resembled a “gigantic cheese box” on an “immense shingle,” with two guns mounted on a revolving turret. On March 8, 1862, the Merrimack attacked three wooden Union warships, sinking the first, burning the second, and driving the third aground. The Monitor arrived and, the following day, engaged the Confederate vessel. Although the battle was a draw, the era of wooden fighting ships was over.

**NEW WEAPONS** Even more deadly than the development of ironclad ships was the invention of the rifle and the minie ball. Rifles were more accurate than old-fashioned muskets, and soldiers could load rifles more quickly and therefore fire more rounds during battle. The minie ball was a soft lead bullet that was more destructive than earlier bullets. Troops in the Civil War also used primitive hand grenades and land mines.
The new technology gradually changed military strategy. Because the rifle and the minié could kill far more people than older weapons, soldiers fighting from inside trenches or behind barricades had a great advantage in mass infantry attacks.

### The War for the Capitals

As the campaign in the west progressed and the Union navy tightened its blockade of Southern ports, the third part of the North’s three-part strategy—the plan to capture the Confederate capital at Richmond—faltered. One of the problems was General McClellan.

Although he was an excellent administrator and popular with his troops, McClellan was extremely cautious. After five full months of training an army of 120,000 men, he insisted that he could not move against Richmond until he had 270,000 men. He complained that there were only two bridges across the Potomac, not enough for an orderly retreat should the Confederates repulse the Federals. Northern newspapers began to mock his daily bulletins of “All quiet on the Potomac,” and even the patient Lincoln commented that he would like to “borrow McClellan’s army if the general himself was not going to use it.”

**“ON TO RICHMOND”** After dawdling all winter, McClellan finally got under way in the spring of 1862. He transported the Army of the Potomac slowly toward the Confederate capital. On the way he encountered a Confederate army commanded by General Joseph E. Johnston. After a series of battles, Johnston was wounded, and command of the army passed to **Robert E. Lee**.

Lee was very different from McClellan—modest rather than vain, and willing to go beyond military textbooks in his tactics. He had opposed secession. However, he declined an offer to head the Union army and cast his lot with his beloved state of Virginia.

Determined to save Richmond, Lee moved against McClellan in a series of battles known collectively as the Seven Days’ Battles, fought from June 25 to July 1, 1862. Although the Confederates had fewer soldiers and suffered higher casualties, Lee’s determination and unorthodox tactics so unnerved McClellan that he backed away from Richmond and headed down the peninsula to the sea.

**ANTIETAM** Now Lee moved against the enemy’s capital. On August 29 and 30, his troops won a resounding victory at the Second Battle of Bull Run. A few days later, they crossed the Potomac into the Union state of Maryland. A resident of one Potomac River town described the starving Confederate troops.

---

**A PERSONAL VOICE  MARY BEDINGER MITCHELL**

“All day they crowded to the doors of our houses, with always the same drawling complaint: ‘I’ve been a-marchin’ and a-fightin’ for six weeks stiddy, and I ain’t had n-a-r-thin’ to eat ’cept green apples an’ green cawn, an’ I wish you’d please to gimme a bite to eat.’ . . . That they could march or fight at all seemed incredible.”

—quoted in *Battle Cry of Freedom*
At this point McClellan had a tremendous stroke of luck. A Union corporal, exploring a meadow where the Confederates had camped, found a copy of Lee’s army orders wrapped around a bunch of cigars! The plan revealed that Lee’s and Stonewall Jackson’s armies were separated for the moment.

For once McClellan acted aggressively and ordered his men forward after Lee. The two armies fought on September 17 beside a sluggish creek called the Antietam (än-tē’tam). The clash proved to be the bloodiest single-day battle in American history. Casualties totaled more than 26,000, as many as in the War of 1812 and the war with Mexico combined. Instead of pursuing the battered Confederate army and possibly ending the Civil War, however, McClellan, cautious as always, did nothing. Though the battle itself was a standoff, the South, which had lost a quarter of its men, retreated the next day across the Potomac into Virginia.

On November 7, 1862, Lincoln fired McClellan. This solved one problem by getting rid of the general whom Lincoln characterized as having “the slows.” However, the president would soon face a diplomatic conflict with Britain and increased pressure from abolitionists.

### ASSESSMENT

1. **TERMS & NAMES** For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.
   - Fort Sumter
   - Anaconda plan
   - Bull Run
   - Stonewall Jackson
   - George McClellan
   - Ulysses S. Grant
   - Shiloh
   - David G. Farragut
   - Monitor
   - Merrimack
   - Robert E. Lee
   - Antietam

### MAIN IDEA

2. **TAKING NOTES**

   For each month listed below, create a newspaper headline summarizing a key Civil War battle that occurred. Write your headlines in a chart like the one shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Headline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Headline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRITICAL THINKING

3. **HYPOTHESIZING**

   What if Virginia had not seceded from the Union in 1861? Speculate on how this might have affected the course of the war. Support your answer with examples. **Think About:**
   - Virginia’s influence on other Southern states
   - Virginia’s location and its human and material resources
   - how the North’s military strategy might have been different

4. **DRAWING CONCLUSIONS**

   What do you think were General McClellan’s major tactical errors? Support your response with details from the text.

5. **EVALUATING DECISIONS**

   Do you think Lincoln’s decision to fire McClellan was a good one? Why or why not?
Shortly after the Civil War began, William Yancey of Alabama and two other Confederate diplomats asked Britain—a major importer of Southern cotton—to formally recognize the Confederacy as an independent nation. The British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs met with them twice, but in May 1861, Britain announced its neutrality. Insulted, Yancey returned home and told his fellow Southerners not to hope for British aid.

**A PERSONAL VOICE  WILLIAM YANCEY**

"You have no friends in Europe. . . . The sentiment of Europe is anti-slavery, and that portion of public opinion which forms, and is represented by, the government of Great Britain, is abolition. They will never recognize our independence until our conquering sword hangs dripping over the prostrate heads of the North. . . . It is an error to say that ‘Cotton is King.’ It is not. It is a great and influential factor in commerce, but not its dictator."

—quoted in The Civil War: A Narrative

In spite of Yancey’s words, many Southerners continued to hope that economic necessity would force Britain to come to their aid. Meanwhile, abolitionists waged a public opinion war against slavery, not only in Europe, but in the North.

**Britain Remains Neutral**

A number of economic factors made Britain no longer dependent on Southern cotton. Not only had Britain accumulated a huge cotton inventory just before the outbreak of war, it also found new sources of cotton in Egypt and India. Moreover, when Europe’s wheat crop failed, Northern wheat and corn replaced cotton as an essential import. As one magazine put it, “Old King Cotton’s dead and buried.” Britain decided that neutrality was the best policy—at least for a while.

**THE TRENT AFFAIR** In the fall of 1861, an incident occurred to test that neutrality. The Confederate government sent two diplomats, James Mason and John Slidell, in a second attempt to gain support from Britain and France. The two men
traveled aboard a British merchant ship, the *Trent*. Captain Charles Wilkes of the American warship *San Jacinto* stopped the *Trent* and arrested the two men. The British threatened war against the Union and dispatched 8,000 troops to Canada. Aware of the need to fight just “one war at a time,” Lincoln freed the two prisoners, publicly claiming that Wilkes had acted without orders. Britain was as relieved as the United States was to find a peaceful way out of the crisis.

**Proclaiming Emancipation**

As the South struggled in vain to gain foreign recognition, abolitionist feeling grew in the North. Some Northerners believed that just winning the war would not be enough if the issue of slavery was not permanently settled.

**LINCOLN’S VIEW OF SLAVERY** Although Lincoln disliked slavery, he did not believe that the federal government had the power to abolish it where it already existed. When Horace Greeley urged him in 1862 to transform the war into an abolitionist crusade, Lincoln replied that although it was his personal wish that all men could be free, his official duty was different: “My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or destroy Slavery.”

As the war progressed, however, Lincoln did find a way to use his constitutional war powers to end slavery. Slave labor built fortifications and grew food for the Confederacy. As commander in chief, Lincoln decided that, just as he could order the Union army to seize Confederate supplies, he could also authorize the army to emancipate slaves.

Emancipation offered a strategic benefit. The abolitionist movement was strong in Britain, and emancipation would discourage Britain from supporting the Confederacy. Emancipation was not just a moral issue; it became a weapon of war.

**EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION** On January 1, 1863, Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation. The following portion captured national attention.

> All persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free. . . . And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind, and the gracious favor of Almighty God.

The Proclamation did not free any slaves immediately because it applied only to areas behind Confederate lines, outside Union control. Since the Proclamation was a military action aimed at the states in rebellion, it did not apply to Southern territory already occupied by Union troops nor to the slave states that had not seceded.
KEY PLAYERS

ABRAHAM LINCOLN 1809–1865
Abraham Lincoln was born to illiterate parents, and once said that in his boyhood there was “absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education.” Yet he hungered for knowledge. He educated himself and, after working as rail-splitter, storekeeper, and surveyor, he taught himself law. This led to a career in politics—and eventually to the White House. In Europe at that time, people were more or less fixed in the station into which they had been born. In the United States, Lincoln was free to achieve whatever he could. Small wonder that he fought to preserve the nation he described as “the last best hope of earth.”

JEFFERSON DAVIS 1808–1889
Jefferson Davis, who was named after Thomas Jefferson, was born in Kentucky and grew up in Mississippi. After graduating from West Point, he served in the army and then became a planter. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1846 and again in 1856, resigning when Mississippi seceded. His election as president of the Confederacy dismayed him. As his wife Varina wrote, “I thought his genius was military, but as a party manager he would not succeed.” Varina was right. Davis had poor relations with many Confederate leaders, causing them to put their states’ welfare above the Confederacy’s.

A PERSONAL VOICE  HENRY M. TURNER

“Men squealed, women fainted, dogs barked, white and colored people shook hands, songs were sung, and by this time cannons began to fire at the navy yard... Great processions of colored and white men marched to and fro and passed in front of the White House... The President came to the window... and thousands told him, if he would come out of that palace, they would hug him to death.”

—quoted in Voices from the Civil War

Free blacks also welcomed the section of the Proclamation that allowed them to enlist in the Union army. Even though many had volunteered at the beginning of the war, the regular army had refused to take them. Now they could fight and help put an end to slavery.

Not everyone in the North approved of the Emancipation Proclamation, however. The Democrats claimed that it would only prolong the war by antagonizing the South. Many Union soldiers accepted it grudgingly, saying they had no love for abolitionists or African Americans, but they would support emancipation if that was what it took to reunify the nation.

Confederates reacted to the Proclamation with outrage. Jefferson Davis called it the “most execrable [hateful] measure recorded in the history of guilty man.” As Northern Democrats had predicted, the Proclamation had made the Confederacy more determined than ever to fight to preserve its way of life.

After the Emancipation Proclamation, compromise was no longer an option. The Confederacy knew that if it lost, its slave-holding society would perish, and the Union knew that it could win only by completely defeating the Confederacy. From January 1863 on, it was a fight to the death.
Both Sides Face Political Problems

Neither side in the Civil War was completely unified. There were Confederate sympathizers in the North, and Union sympathizers in the South. Such divided loyalties created two problems: How should the respective governments handle their critics? How could they ensure a steady supply of fighting men for their armies?

DEALING WITH DISSENT  Lincoln dealt forcefully with disloyalty. For example, when a Baltimore crowd attacked a Union regiment a week after Fort Sumter, Lincoln sent federal troops to Maryland. He also suspended in that state the writ of habeas corpus, a court order that requires authorities to bring a person held in jail before the court to determine why he or she is being jailed. Lincoln used this same strategy later in the war to deal with dissent in other states. As a result, more than 13,000 suspected Confederate sympathizers in the Union were arrested and held without trial, although most were quickly released. The president also seized telegraph offices to make sure no one used the wires for subversion. When Supreme Court Chief Justice Roger Taney declared that Lincoln had gone beyond his constitutional powers, the president ignored his ruling.

Those arrested included Copperheads, or Northern Democrats who advocated peace with the South. Ohio congressman Clement Vallandigham was the most famous Copperhead. Vallandigham was tried and convicted by a military court for urging Union soldiers to desert and for advocating an armistice.

Jefferson Davis at first denounced Lincoln’s suspension of civil liberties. Later, however, Davis found it necessary to follow the Union president’s example. In 1862, he suspended habeas corpus in the Confederacy.

Lincoln’s action in dramatically expanding presidential powers to meet the crises of wartime set a precedent in U.S. history. Since then, some presidents have cited war or “national security” as a reason to expand the powers of the executive branch of government.

CONSCRIPTION  Although both armies originally relied on volunteers, it didn’t take long before heavy casualties and widespread desertions led to conscription, a draft that would force certain members of the population to serve in the army. The Confederacy passed a draft law in 1862, and the Union followed suit in 1863. Both laws ran into trouble.

The Confederate law drafted all able-bodied white men between the ages of 18 and 35. (In 1864, as the Confederacy suffered more losses, the limits changed to 17 and 50.) However, those who could afford to were allowed to hire substitutes to serve in their places. The law also exempted planters who owned 20 or more slaves. Poor Confederates howled that it was a “rich man’s war but a poor man’s fight.” In spite of these protests, almost 90 percent of eligible Southern men served in the Confederate army.

The Union law drafted white men between 20 and 45 for three years, although it, too, allowed draftees to hire substitutes. It also provided for commutation, or paying a $300 fee to avoid conscription altogether. In the end, only 46,000 draftees actually went into the army. Ninety-two percent of the approximately 2 million soldiers who served in the Union army were volunteers—180,000 of them African-American.

THE CHEROKEE AND THE WAR

Another nation divided by the Civil War was the Cherokee Nation. Both the North and the South wanted the Cherokee on their side. This was because the Cherokee Nation was located in the Indian Territory, an excellent grain- and livestock-producing area. For their part, the Cherokee felt drawn to both sides—to the Union because federal treaties guaranteed Cherokee rights, and to the Confederacy because many Cherokee owned slaves.

The Cherokee signed a treaty with the South in October 1861. However, the alliance did not last. Efforts by the pro-Confederate leader Stand Watie (below) to govern the Cherokee Nation failed, and federal troops invaded Indian Territory. Many Cherokee deserted from the Confederate army; some joined the Union. In February 1863, the pro-Union Cherokee revoked the Confederate treaty.
DRAFT RIOTS In 1863 New York City was a tinderbox waiting to explode. Poor people were crowded into slums, crime and disease ran rampant, and poverty was ever-present. Poor white workers—especially Irish immigrants—thought it unfair that they should have to fight a war to free slaves. The white workers feared that Southern blacks would come north and compete for jobs. When officials began to draw names for the draft, angry men gathered all over the city to complain.

For four days, July 13–16, mobs rampaged through the city. The rioters wrecked draft offices, Republican newspaper offices, and the homes of antislavery leaders. They attacked well-dressed men on the street (those likely to be able to pay the $300 commutation fee) and attacked African Americans. By the time federal troops ended the melee, more than 100 persons lay dead.

The draft riots were not the only dramatic development away from the battlefield. Society was also experiencing other types of unrest.
The Civil War brought about dramatic social and economic changes in American society.

The expansion of roles for African Americans and women set the stage for later equalities of opportunity.

The Civil War brought about dramatic social and economic changes in American society. The expansion of roles for African Americans and women set the stage for later equalities of opportunity.

One American’s Story

Mary Chesnut, a well-born Southerner whose husband served in the Confederate government, kept a diary describing key war events, such as the attack on Fort Sumter. Her diary paints a vivid picture as well of the marriages and flirtations, hospital work, and dinner parties that comprised daily life in the South.

In 1864, Chesnut found that her social standing could no longer protect her from the economic effects of the war.

A PERSONAL VOICE  MARY CHESNUT

“September 19th . . . My pink silk dress I have sold for six hundred dollars, to be paid in installments, two hundred a month for three months. And I sell my eggs and butter from home for two hundred dollars a month. Does it not sound well—four hundred dollars a month, regularly? In what? ‘In Confederate money.’ Hélas! [Alas!]”

—quoted in Mary Chesnut’s Civil War

The “Confederate money” Chesnut received was almost worthless. Inflation, or a sharp increase in the cost of living, had devalued Confederate currency to such an extent that $400 was worth only a dollar or two compared to prewar currency. Not all the effects of the Civil War were economic—the war also caused profound social changes.

African Americans Fight for Freedom

African Americans played an important role in the struggle to end slavery. Some served as soldiers, while others took action away from the battlefield.

AFRICAN–AMERICAN SOLDIERS When the Civil War started, it was a white man’s war. Neither the Union nor the Confederacy officially accepted African Americans as soldiers.

In 1862, Congress passed a law allowing African Americans to serve in the military. It was only after the Emancipation Proclamation was decreed, however,
Battery A of the 2nd United States Colored Artillery at gun drill

HISTORICAL SPOTLIGHT

GLORY FOR THE 54TH MASSACHUSETTS
In July 1863, the African-American 54th Massachusetts Infantry, including two sons of Frederick Douglass, led an assault on Fort Wagner, near Charleston harbor. The attack failed. More than 40 percent of the soldiers were killed. Confederates found the regiment’s flag (above) under a pile of dead soldiers. Among the dead was the white commander, Colonel Robert G. Shaw. Among the survivors were Douglass’s sons and Sergeant William Carney, the first African American to win a Congressional Medal of Honor.

As the New York Tribune pointed out, “If this Massachusetts 54th had faltered when its trial came, 200,000 troops for whom it was a pioneer would never have put into the field.” Shaw’s father declared that his son lay “with his brave, devoted followers. . . . what a bodyguard he has!”

MAIN IDEA

Drawing Conclusions
How did African Americans contribute to the struggle to end slavery?

that large-scale enlistment occurred. Although African Americans made up only 1 percent of the North’s population, by war’s end nearly 10 percent of the Union army was African American. The majority were former slaves from Virginia and other slave states, both Confederate and Union.

Although accepted as soldiers, African Americans suffered discrimination. They served in separate regiments commanded by white officers. Usually African Americans could not rise above the rank of captain—although Alexander T. Augustana, a surgeon, did attain the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. White privates earned $13 a month, plus a $3.50 clothing allowance. Black privates earned only $10 a month, with no clothing allowance. Blacks protested, and several regiments served without pay for months rather than accept the lesser amount. Congress finally equalized the pay of white and African-American soldiers in 1864.

The mortality rate for African-American soldiers was higher than that for white soldiers, primarily because many African Americans were assigned to labor duty in the garrisons, where they were likely to catch typhoid, pneumonia, malaria, or some other deadly disease. Then, too, the Confederacy would not treat captured African-American soldiers as prisoners of war. Many were executed on the spot, and those who were not killed were returned to slavery. A particularly gruesome massacre occurred at Fort Pillow, Tennessee, in 1864. Confederate troops killed over 200 African-American prisoners and some whites as they begged for their lives.

Even though most Southerners opposed the idea of African-American soldiers, the Confederacy did consider drafting slaves and free blacks in 1863 and again in 1864. One Louisiana planter argued that since slaves “caused the fight,” they should share in the burden of battle. Georgia general Howell Cobb responded, “If slaves will make good soldiers our whole theory of slavery is wrong.”

SLAVE RESISTANCE IN THE CONFEDERACY As Union forces pushed deeper into Confederate territory, thousands of slaves sought freedom behind the lines of the Union army. Those who remained on plantations sometimes engaged in sabotage, breaking plows, destroying fences, and neglecting livestock. When Southern plantation owners fled before approaching Union troops, many slaves refused to be dragged along. They waited to welcome the Yankees, who had the power to liberate them.

For whites on farms and plantations in the South, slave resistance compounded the stresses and privations of the war. Fearful of a general slave uprising, Southerners tightened slave patrols and spread rumors about how Union soldiers abused runaways. No general uprising occurred, but slave resistance gradually weakened the plantation system. By 1864 even many Confederates realized that slavery was doomed.
The War Affects Regional Economies

The decline of the plantation system was not the only economic effect that the Civil War caused. Other effects included inflation and a new type of federal tax. In general, the war expanded the North’s economy while shattering that of the South.

SOUTHERN SHORTAGES The Confederacy soon faced a food shortage due to three factors: the drain of manpower into the army, the Union occupation of food-growing areas, and the loss of slaves to work in the fields. Meat became a once-a-week luxury at best, and even such staples as rice and corn were in short supply. Food prices skyrocketed. In 1861 the average family spent $6.65 a month on food. By mid-1863, it was spending $68 a month—if it could find any food to buy. The situation grew so desperate that in 1863 hundreds of women and children—and some men—stormed bakeries and rioted for bread. Mrs. Roger A. Pryor remembered talking to an 18-year-old member of a mob in Richmond on April 2, 1863.

A PERSONAL VOICE MRS. ROGER A. PRYOR

“As she raised her hand to remove her sunbonnet, her loose calico sleeve slipped up, and revealed a mere skeleton of an arm. She perceived my expression as I looked at it, and hastily pulled down her sleeve with a short laugh. ‘This is all that’s left of me!’ she said. ‘It seems real funny, don’t it? . . . We are going to the bakeries and each of us will take a loaf of bread. That is little enough for the government to give us after it has taken all our men.’”

—quoted in Battle Cry of Freedom

The mob broke up only when President Jefferson Davis climbed up on a cart, threw down all the money he had, and ordered the crowd to disperse or be shot. The next day, the Confederate government distributed some of its stocks of rice.

The Union blockade of Southern ports created shortages of other items, too, including salt, sugar, coffee, nails, needles, and medicines. One result was that many Confederates smuggled cotton into the North in exchange for gold, food, and other goods. Deploping this trade with the enemy, one Confederate general raged that cotton had made “more damn rascals on both sides than anything else.”

NORTHERN ECONOMIC GROWTH Overall, the war’s effect on the economy of the North was much more positive. Although a few industries, such as cotton textiles, declined, most boomed. The army’s need for uniforms, shoes, guns, and other supplies supported woolen mills, steel foundries, coal mines, and many other industries. Because the draft reduced the available work force, western wheat farmers bought reapers and other labor-saving machines, which benefited the companies that manufactured those machines.

The economic boom had a dark side, though. Wages did not keep up with prices, and many people’s standard of living declined. When white male workers went out on strike, employers hired free blacks, immigrants, women, and boys to replace them for lower pay.
Northern women—who like many Southern women replaced men on farms and in city jobs—also obtained government jobs for the first time. They worked mostly as clerks, copying ledgers and letters by hand. Although they earned less than men, they remained a regular part of the Washington work force after the war.

Because of the booming economy and rising prices, many businesses in the North made immense profits. This was especially true of those with government contracts, mostly because such contractors often cheated. They supplied uniforms and blankets made of “shoddy”—fibers reclaimed from rags—that came apart in the rain. They passed off spoiled meat as fresh and demanded twice the usual price for guns. This corruption spilled over into the general society. The New York Herald commented on the changes in the American character: “The individual who makes the most money—no matter how—and spends the most—no matter for what—is considered the greatest man. . . . The world has seen its iron age, its silver age, its golden age, and its brazen age. This is the age of shoddy.”

Congress decided to help pay for the war by tapping its citizens’ wealth. In 1863 Congress enacted the tax law that authorized the nation’s first income tax, a tax that takes a specified percentage of an individual’s income.

**Soldiers Suffer on Both Sides**

Both Union and Confederate soldiers had marched off to war thinking it would prove to be a glorious affair. They were soon disillusioned, not just by heavy casualties but also by poor living conditions, diet, and medical care.

**LIVES ON THE LINES** Garbage disposal and latrines in army camps were almost unknown. Although army regulations called for washing one’s hands and face every day and taking a complete bath once a week, many soldiers failed to do so. As a result, body lice, dysentery, and diarrhea were common.

Army rations were far from appealing. Union troops subsisted on beans, bacon, and hardtack—square biscuits that were supposedly hard enough to stop a bullet. As one Northerner wrote:

> The soldiers’ fare is very rough,  
> The bread is hard, the beef is tough;  
> If they can stand it, it will be,  
> Through love of God, a mystery.
In the Civil War, weapons technology overtook medical technology. Minie balls, soft lead bullets, caused traumatic wounds that could often be treated only by amputation. As the effects of bacteria were not yet known, surgeons never sterilized instruments, making infection one of soldiers' worst enemies.

Field Hospitals
The badly wounded were taken to field hospitals, like this one at Gettysburg. The surgeon is preparing for an amputation; the man behind the patient administers an anesthetic, probably chloroform.

Confederate troops fared equally poorly. A common food was “cush,” a stew of small cubes of beef and crumbled cornbread mixed with bacon grease. Fresh vegetables were hardly ever available. Both sides loved coffee, but Southern soldiers had only substitutes brewed from peanuts, dried apples, or corn.

CIVIL WAR MEDICINE
Soon after Fort Sumter fell, the federal government set up the United States Sanitary Commission. Its task was twofold: to improve the hygienic conditions of army camps and to recruit and train nurses. The “Sanitary” proved a great success. It sent out agents to teach soldiers such things as how to avoid polluting their water supply. It developed hospital trains and hospital ships to transport wounded men from the battlefield.

At the age of 60, Dorothea Dix became the nation’s first superintendent of women nurses. To discourage women looking for romance, Dix insisted applicants be at least 30 and “very plain-looking.” Impressed by the work of women nurses he observed, the surgeon general required that at least one-third of Union hospital nurses be women; some 3,000 served. Union nurse Clara Barton often cared for the sick and wounded at the front lines. After her courage under fire at Antietam, a surgeon described her as the “angel of the battlefield.”

As a result of the Sanitary Commission’s work, the death rate among Union wounded, although terrible by 20th-century standards, showed considerable improvement over that of previous wars.

The Confederacy did not have a Sanitary Commission, but thousands of Southern women volunteered as nurses. Sally Tompkins, for example, performed so heroically in her hospital duties that she eventually was commissioned as a captain.
PRISONS Improvements in hygiene and nursing did not reach the war prisons, where conditions were even worse than in army camps. The worst Confederate prison, at Andersonville, Georgia, jammed 33,000 men into 26 acres, or about 34 square feet per man. The prisoners had no shelter from the broiling sun or chilling rain except what they made themselves by rigging primitive tents of blankets and sticks. They drank from the same stream that served as their sewer. About a third of Andersonville’s prisoners died. Part of the blame rested with the camp’s commander, Henry Wirz (whom the North eventually executed as a war criminal). The South’s lack of food and tent canvas also contributed to the appalling conditions. In addition, the prisons were overcrowded because the North had halted prisoner exchanges when the South refused to return African-American soldiers who had been captured in battle.

Prison camps in the North—such as those at Elmira, New York, and at Camp Douglas, Illinois—were only slightly better. Northern prisons provided about five times as much space per man, barracks for sleeping, and adequate food. However, thousands of Confederates, housed in quarters with little or no heat, contracted pneumonia and died. Hundreds of others suffered from dysentery and malnutrition, from which some did not recover. Historians estimate that 15 percent of Union prisoners in Southern prisons died, while 12 percent of Confederate prisoners died in Northern prisons.

A series of battles in the Mississippi Valley and in the East soon sent a fresh wave of prisoners of war flooding into prison camps.

The Confederate prison at Andersonville, Georgia, in 1864

**TERMS & NAMES**

For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.

- Fort Pillow
- Income tax
- Clara Barton
- Andersonville

**MAJOR IDEA**

Economic changes that occurred as a result of the Civil War. Explain how these changes affected the two regions.

**CRITICAL THINKING**

What effects did the Civil War have on women and African Americans?

**Think About:**

- new opportunities in both the North and the South
- discriminatory practices that persisted for both groups

**SYNTHESIZING**

Imagine you were one of the Northern women and doctors who convinced the government to establish the Sanitary Commission. What reasons would you have offered to justify this commission? Use details from the text to support your response.
Key victories at Vicksburg and Gettysburg helped the Union wear down the Confederacy.

These victories clinched the North's win and led to the preservation of the Union.

- Gettysburg
- Chancellorsville
- Vicksburg
- Gettysburg Address
- William Tecumseh Sherman
- Appomattox Court House

 Shortly after three o'clock on the afternoon of July 3, 1863, from behind a stone wall on a ridge south of the little town of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, Union troops watched thousands of Confederate soldiers advance toward them across an open field. Union officer Frank Aretas Haskell described the scene.

“A PERSONAL VOICE
FRANK ARETAS HASKELL

“More than half a mile their front extends ... man touching man, rank pressing rank. . . . The red flags wave, their horsemen gallop up and down, the arms of [thirteen] thousand men, barrel and bayonet, gleam in the sun, a sloping forest of flashing steel. Right on they move, as with one soul, in perfect order without impediment of ditch, or wall, or stream, over ridge and slope, through orchard and meadow, and cornfield, magnificent, grim, irresistible.”

—quoted in The Civil War: An Illustrated History

An hour later, half of the Confederate force lay dead or wounded, cut down by crossfire from massed Union guns. Because of the North’s heavy weaponry, it had become suicide for unprotected troops to assault a strongly fortified position.

Armies Clash at Gettysburg

The July 3 infantry charge was part of a three-day battle at Gettysburg, which many historians consider the turning point of the Civil War. The battle of Gettysburg crippled the South so badly that General Lee would never again possess sufficient forces to invade a Northern state.
PRELUDE TO GETTYSBURG

The year 1863 actually had gone well for the South. During the first four days of May, the South defeated the North at Chancellorsville, Virginia. Lee outmaneuvered Union general Joseph Hooker and forced the Union army to retreat. The North’s only consolation after Chancellorsville came as the result of an accident. As General Stonewall Jackson returned from a patrol on May 2, Confederate guards mistook him for a Yankee and shot him in the left arm. A surgeon amputated his arm the following day. When Lee heard the news, he exclaimed, “He has lost his left arm, but I have lost my right.” But the true loss was still to come; Jackson caught pneumonia and died May 10.

Despite Jackson’s tragic death, Lee decided to press his military advantage and invade the North. He needed supplies, he hoped that an invasion would force Lincoln to pull troops away from Vicksburg, and he thought that a major Confederate victory on Northern soil might tip the political balance of power in the Union to pro-Southern Democrats. Accordingly, he crossed the Potomac into Maryland and then pushed on into Pennsylvania.

GETTYSBURG

The most decisive battle of the war was fought near Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. The town was an unlikely spot for a bloody battle—and indeed, no one planned to fight there.

Confederate soldiers led by A. P. Hill, many of them barefoot, heard there was a supply of footwear in Gettysburg and went to find it, and also to meet up with forces under General Lee. When Hill’s troops marched toward Gettysburg, they ran into a couple of brigades of Union cavalry under the command of John Buford, an experienced officer from Illinois.
Buendorf ordered his men to take defensive positions on the hills and ridges surrounding the town, from which they engaged Hill’s troops. The shooting attracted more troops and each side sent for reinforcements.

The Northern armies, now under the command of General George Meade, that were north and west of Gettysburg began to fall back under a furious rebel assault. The Confederates took control of the town. Lee knew, however, that the battle would not be won unless the Northerners were also forced to yield their positions on Cemetery Ridge, the high ground south of Gettysburg.

**THE SECOND DAY** On July 2, almost 90,000 Yankees and 75,000 Confederates stood ready to fight for Gettysburg. Lee ordered General James Longstreet to attack Cemetery Ridge, which was held by Union troops. At about 4:00 P.M., Longstreet’s troops advanced from Seminary Ridge, through the peach orchard and wheat field that stood between them and the Union position.

The yelling Rebels overran Union troops who had mistakenly left their positions on Little Round Top, a hill that overlooked much of the southern portion of the battlefield. As a brigade of Alabamans approached the hill, however, Union leaders noticed the undefended position. Colonel Joshua L. Chamberlain, who had been a language professor before the war, led his Maine troops to meet the Rebels, and succeeded in repulsing repeated Confederate attacks. When his soldiers ran short of ammunition and more than a third of the brigade had fallen, Chamberlain ordered a bayonet charge at the Confederates.

The Rebels, exhausted by the uphill fighting and the 25-mile march of the previous day, were shocked by the Union assault and surrendered in droves. Chamberlain and his men succeeded in saving the Union lines from certain rebel artillery attacks from Little Round Top. Although the Union troops had given some ground, their lines still held at the close of day.

**THE THIRD DAY** Lee was optimistic, however. With one more day of determined attack, he felt he could break the Union defenses. Early in the afternoon of July 3, Lee ordered an artillery barrage on the middle of the Union lines. For two hours, the two armies fired at one another in a vicious exchange that could be heard in Pittsburgh. When the Union...
artillery fell silent, Lee insisted that Longstreet press forward. Longstreet reluctantly ordered his men, including those under the command of General Pickett, to attack the center of the Union lines. Deliberately, they marched across the farmland toward the Union high ground. Suddenly, Northern artillery renewed its barrage. Some of the Confederates had nearly reached the Union lines when Yankee infantry fired on them as well. Devastated, the Confederates staggered back. The Northerners had succeeded in holding the high ground south of Gettysburg.

Lee sent cavalry led by General James E. B. (Jeb) Stuart circling around the right flank of Meade’s forces, hoping they would surprise the Union troops from the rear and meet Longstreet’s men in the middle. Stuart’s campaign stalled, however, when his men clashed with Union forces under David Gregg three miles away.

Not knowing that Gregg had stopped Stuart nor that Lee’s army was severely weakened, Union general Meade never ordered a counterattack. After the battle, Lee gave up any hopes of invading the North and led his army in a long, painful retreat back to Virginia through a pelting rain.

The three-day battle produced staggering losses. Total casualties were more than 30 percent. Union losses included 23,000 men killed or wounded. For the Confederacy, approximately 28,000 were killed or wounded. Fly-infested corpses lay everywhere in the July heat; the stench was unbearable. Lee would continue to lead his men brilliantly in the next two years of the war, but neither he nor the Confederacy would ever recover from the loss at Gettysburg or the surrender of Vicksburg, which occurred the very next day.

Grant Wins at Vicksburg

While the Army of the Potomac was turning back the Confederates in central Pennsylvania, Union general Ulysses S. Grant continued his campaign in the west. Vicksburg, Mississippi, was one of only two Confederate holdouts preventing the Union from taking complete control of the Mississippi River, an important waterway for transporting goods.

VICKSBURG UNDER SIEGE In the spring of 1863, Grant sent a cavalry brigade to destroy rail lines in central Mississippi and draw attention away from the port city. While the Confederate forces were distracted, Grant was able to land infantry south of Vicksburg late on April 30. In 18 days, Union forces whipped several rebel units and sacked Jackson, the capital of the state.

Their confidence growing with every victory, Grant and his troops rushed to Vicksburg. Two frontal assaults on the city failed; so, in the last week of May 1863, Grant settled in for a siege. He set up a steady barrage of artillery, shelling the city from both the river and the land for several hours a day and forcing its residents to take shelter in caves that they dug out of the yellow clay hillsides.

Food supplies ran so low that people ate dogs and mules. At last some of the starving Confederate soldiers defending Vicksburg sent their commander a petition saying, “If you can’t feed us, you’d better surrender.”

On July 3, 1863, the same day as Pickett’s charge, the Confederate commander of Vicksburg asked Grant for terms of surrender. The city fell on July 4. Five days later Port Hudson, Louisiana, the last Confederate holdout on the Mississippi, also fell—and the Confederacy was cut in two.
The Gettysburg Address

In November 1863, a ceremony was held to dedicate a cemetery in Gettysburg. The first speaker was Edward Everett, a noted orator, who gave a flowery two-hour oration. Then Abraham Lincoln spoke for a little more than two minutes. According to the historian Garry Wills, Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address “remade America.” Before the war, people said, “The United States are.” After Lincoln’s speech, they said, “The United States is.”

The Gettysburg Address  Abraham Lincoln

“Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

—The Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863

Main Idea

Summarizing

What beliefs about the United States did Lincoln express in the Gettysburg Address?
The Confederacy Wears Down

The twin defeats at Gettysburg and Vicksburg cost the South much of its limited fighting power. The Confederacy was already low on food, shoes, uniforms, guns, and ammunition. No longer able to attack, it could hope only to hang on long enough to destroy Northern morale and work toward an armistice—a cease-fire agreement based on mutual consent—rather than a surrender. That plan proved increasingly unlikely, however. Southern newspapers, state legislatures, and individuals began to call openly for an end to the hostilities, and President Lincoln finally found not just one but two generals who would fight.

CONFEDERATE MORALE As war progressed, morale on the Confederacy’s home front deteriorated. The Confederate Congress passed a weak resolution in 1863 urging planters to grow fewer cash crops like cotton and tobacco and increase production of food. Farmers resented the tax that took part of their produce and livestock, especially since many rich planters continued to cultivate cotton and tobacco—in some cases even selling crops to the North. Many soldiers deserted after receiving letters from home about the lack of food and the shortage of farm labor to work the farms. In every Southern state except South Carolina, there were soldiers who decided to turn and fight for the North—for example, 2,400 Floridians served in the Union army.

Discord in the Confederate government made it impossible for Jefferson Davis to govern effectively. Members of the Confederate Congress squabbled among themselves. In South Carolina, the governor was upset when troops from his state were placed under the command of officers from another state.

In 1863, North Carolinians who wanted peace held more than 100 open meetings in their state. A similar peace movement sprang up in Georgia in early 1864. Although these movements failed, by mid-1864, Assistant Secretary of War John Campbell was forced to acknowledge that active opposition to the war “in the mountain districts of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama menaces the existence of the Confederacy as fatally as ... the armies of the United States.”

KEY PLAYERS

ULYSSES S. GRANT 1822–1885

U. S. Grant once said of himself, “A military life had no charms for me.” Yet, a military man was what he was destined to be. He fought in the war with Mexico—even though he termed it “wicked”—because he believed his duty was to serve his country. His next post was in the West, where Grant grew so lonely for his family that he resigned. When the Civil War began, Grant served as colonel of the Illinois volunteers because General McClellan had been too busy to see him!

However, once Grant began fighting in Tennessee, Lincoln recognized his abilities. When newspapers demanded Grant’s dismissal after Shiloh, Lincoln replied, “I can’t spare this man. He fights.”

ROBERT E. LEE 1807–1870

Lee was an aristocrat. His father had been one of George Washington’s best generals, and his wife was the great-granddaughter of Martha Washington. As a man who believed slavery was evil, Lee nonetheless fought for the Confederacy out of loyalty to his beloved home state of Virginia. “I did only what my duty demanded. I could have taken no other course without dishonor,” he said.

As a general, Lee was brilliant, but he seldom challenged civilian leaders about their failure to provide his army with adequate supplies. His soldiers—who called him Uncle Robert—almost worshiped him because he insisted on sharing their hardships.

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Effects

E How did discontent among members of the Confederate Congress affect the war?
GRANT APPOINTS SHERMAN In March 1864, President Lincoln appointed Ulysses S. Grant, the hero of the battle at Vicksburg, commander of all Union armies. Grant in turn appointed William Tecumseh Sherman as commander of the military division of the Mississippi. These two appointments would change the course of the war.

Old friends and comrades in arms, both men believed in total war. They believed that it was essential to fight not only the South’s armies and government but its civilian population as well. They reasoned, first, that civilians produced the weapons, grew the food, and transported the goods on which the armies relied, and, second, that the strength of the people’s will kept the war going. If the Union destroyed that will to fight, the Confederacy would collapse.

GRANT AND LEE IN VIRGINIA Grant’s overall strategy was to immobilize Lee’s army in Virginia while Sherman raided Georgia. Even if Grant’s casualties ran twice as high as those of Lee—and they did—the North could afford it. The South could not.

Starting in May 1864, Grant threw his troops into battle after battle, the first in a wooded area, known as the Wilderness, near Fredericksburg, Virginia. The fighting was brutal, made even more so by the fires spreading through the thick trees. The string of battles continued at Spotsylvania, at Cold Harbor (where Grant lost 7,000 men in one hour), and finally at Petersburg, which would remain under Union attack from June 1864 to April 1865.

During the period from May 4 to June 18, 1864, Grant lost nearly 60,000 men—which the North could replace—to Lee’s 32,000 men—which the South could not replace. Democrats and Northern newspapers called Grant a butcher. However, Grant kept going because he had promised Lincoln, “Whatever happens, there will be no turning back.”
SHERMAN’S MARCH After Sherman’s army occupied the transportation center of Atlanta on September 2, 1864, a Confederate army tried to circle around him and cut his railroad supply lines. Sherman decided to fight a different battle. He would abandon his supply lines and march southeast through Georgia, creating a wide path of destruction and living off the land as he went. He would make Southerners “so sick of war that generations would pass away before they would again appeal to it.” In mid-November he burned most of Atlanta and set out toward the coast. A Georgia girl described the result.

A PERSONAL VOICE ELIZA FRANCES ANDREWS

“The fields were trampled down and the road was lined with carcasses of horses, hogs, and cattle that the invaders, unable either to consume or to carry away with them, had wantonly shot down, to starve out the people and prevent them from making their crops. . . . The dwellings that were standing all showed signs of pillage . . . while here and there lone chimney stacks, ‘Sherman’s sentinels,’ told of homes laid in ashes.”

—quoted in Voices from the Civil War

After taking Savannah just before Christmas, Sherman’s troops turned north to help Grant “wipe out Lee.” Following behind them now were about 25,000 former slaves eager for freedom. As the army marched through South Carolina in 1865, it inflicted even more destruction than it had in Georgia. As one Union private exclaimed, “Here is where treason began and, by God, here is where it shall end!” The army burned almost every house in its path. In contrast, when Sherman’s forces entered North Carolina, which had been the last state to secede, they stopped destroying private homes and—anticipating the end of the war—began handing out food and other supplies.

THE ELECTION OF 1864 As the 1864 presidential election approached, Lincoln faced heavy opposition. Many Democrats, dismayed at the war’s length, its high casualty rates, and recent Union losses, joined pro-Southern party members to nominate George McClellan on a platform of an immediate armistice. Still resentful over having been fired by Lincoln, McClellan was delighted to run.

Lincoln’s other opponents, the Radical Republicans, favored a harsher proposal than Lincoln’s for readmitting the Confederate states. They formed a third political party and nominated John C. Frémont as their candidate. To attract Democrats, Lincoln’s supporters dropped the Republican name, retitled themselves the National Union Party, and chose Andrew Johnson, a pro-Union Democrat from Tennessee, as Lincoln’s running mate.

Lincoln was pessimistic about his chances. “I am going to be beaten,” he said in August, “and unless some great change takes place, badly beaten.” However, some great change did take place. On August 5, Admiral David Farragut entered Mobile Bay in Alabama and within three weeks shut down that major Southern port. On September 2, Sherman telegraphed, “Atlanta is ours.” By month’s end, Frémont had withdrawn from the presidential race. On October 19, General
Philip Sheridan finally chased the Confederates out of the Shenandoah Valley in northern Virginia. The victories buoyed the North, and with the help of absentee ballots cast by Union soldiers, Lincoln won a second term.

**THE SURRENDER AT APPOMATTOX** By late March 1865, it was clear that the end of the Confederacy was near. Grant and Sheridan were approaching Richmond from the west, while Sherman was approaching from the south. On April 2—in response to news that Lee and his troops had been overcome by Grant’s forces at Petersburg—President Davis and his government abandoned their capital, setting it afire to keep the Northerners from taking it. Despite the fire-fighting efforts of Union troops, flames destroyed some 900 buildings and damaged hundreds more.

Lee and Grant met to arrange a Confederate surrender on April 9, 1865, in a Virginia village called Appomattox Court House. At Lincoln’s request, the terms were generous. Grant paroled Lee’s soldiers and sent them home with their personal possessions, horses, and three days’ rations. Officers were permitted to keep their side arms. Within two months all remaining Confederate resistance collapsed. After four long years, at tremendous human and economic costs, the Civil War was over.

**1. TERMS & NAMES** For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.

- Gettysburg
- Vicksburg
- Gettysburg Address
- William Tecumseh Sherman
- Appomattox Court House

**MAIN IDEA**

**2. TAKING NOTES** Create a time line of the major battles and political events relating to the final two years of the Civil War. Use the dates already plotted on the time line below as a guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 1863</th>
<th>March 1864</th>
<th>April 1865</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Which event was the turning point? Why?

**3. EVALUATING** Do you think that a general’s win-loss record on the battlefield is the best gauge of measuring greatness as a military leader? Why or why not? **Think About:**
- Grant’s campaign in Virginia, Sherman’s march to Atlanta, and Lee’s surrender
- Democrats’ and Northern newspapers’ criticism of Grant

**4. EVALUATING DECISIONS** Grant and Sherman presented a logical rationale for using the strategy of total war. Do you think the end—defeating the Confederacy—justified the means—causing harm to civilians? Explain.

**5. ANALYZING MOTIVES** Why do you think Lincoln urged generous terms for a Confederate surrender?
The Legacy of the War

The Civil War settled long-standing disputes over states' rights and slavery. The federal government established supreme authority, and no state has threatened secession since.

**Main Idea**

The Legacy of the War

**WHY IT MATTERS NOW**

Freedom for slaves was not the only legacy of the Civil War. The struggle transformed the nation's economy, its government, the conduct of warfare, and the future careers of many of its participants.

Garland H. White, a former slave from Virginia, marched with other Yankee soldiers into the Confederate capital of Richmond after it fell. Now chaplain of the 28th United States Colored troops, White was returning to the state where he had once served in bondage. As the soldiers marched along the city streets, thousands of African Americans cheered. A large crowd of soldiers and civilians gathered in the neighborhood where the slave market had been. Garland White remembered the scene.

**One American’s Story**

Garland H. White, a former slave from Virginia, marched with other Yankee soldiers into the Confederate capital of Richmond after it fell. Now chaplain of the 28th United States Colored troops, White was returning to the state where he had once served in bondage. As the soldiers marched along the city streets, thousands of African Americans cheered. A large crowd of soldiers and civilians gathered in the neighborhood where the slave market had been. Garland White remembered the scene.

Freedom for slaves was not the only legacy of the Civil War. The struggle transformed the nation’s economy, its government, the conduct of warfare, and the future careers of many of its participants.

**Section 366**

**Chapter 11**

**The War Changes the Nation**

In 1869 Professor George Ticknor of Harvard commented that since the Civil War, “It does not seem to me as if I were living in the country in which I was born.” The Civil War caused tremendous political, economic, technological, and social change in the United States. It also exacted a high price in the cost of human life.
POLITICAL CHANGES Decades before the war, Southern states had threatened secession when federal policies angered them. After the war, the federal government assumed supreme national authority and no state has ever seceded again. The states’ rights issue did not go away; it simply led in a different direction from secession. Today, arguments about states’ rights versus federal control focus on such issues as whether the state or national government should determine how to use local funds.

In addition to ending the threat of secession, the war greatly increased the federal government’s power. Before the Civil War, the federal government had little impact on most people’s daily lives. Most citizens dealt only with their county governments. During the war, however, the federal government reached into people’s pockets, taxing private incomes. It also required everyone to accept its new paper currency (even those who had previously contracted to be repaid in coins). Most dramatically, the federal government tore reluctant men from their families to fight in the war. After the war, U.S. citizens could no longer assume that the national government in Washington was too far away to bother them.

ECONOMIC CHANGES The Civil War had a profound impact on the nation’s economy. Between 1861 and 1865, the federal government did much to help business, in part through subsidizing construction of a national railroad system. The government also passed the National Bank Act of 1863, which set up a system of federally chartered banks, set requirements for loans, and provided for banks to be inspected. These measures helped make banking safer for investors.

The economy of the Northern states boomed. Northern entrepreneurs had grown rich selling war supplies to the government and thus had money to invest in new businesses after the war. As army recruitment created a labor shortage in the North, the sale of labor-saving agricultural tools such as the reaper increased dramatically. By war’s end, large-scale commercial agriculture had taken hold.

The war devastated the South economically. It took away the South’s source of cheap labor—slavery—and also wrecked most of the region’s industry. It wiped out 40 percent of the livestock, destroyed much of the South’s farm machinery and railroads, and left thousands of acres of land uncultivated.

The economic gap between North and South had widened drastically. Before the war, Southern states held 30 percent of the national wealth; in 1870 they held...
only 12 percent. In 1860, Southerners earned about 70 percent of the Northern average; in 1870, they earned less than 40 percent. This economic disparity between the regions would not diminish until the 20th century.

**COSTS OF THE WAR** The human costs of the Civil War were staggering. They affected almost every American family. Approximately 360,000 Union soldiers and 260,000 Confederates died, nearly as many as in all other American wars combined. Another 275,000 Union soldiers and 225,000 Confederates were wounded. Veterans with missing limbs became a common sight nationwide. In addition, military service had occupied some 2,400,000 men—nearly 10 percent of the nation’s population of approximately 31,000,000—for four long years. It disrupted their education, their careers, and their families.

The Civil War’s economic costs were just as extensive. Historians estimate that the Union and the Confederate governments spent a combined total of about $3.3 billion during the four years of war, or more than twice what the government had spent in the previous 80 years! The costs did not stop when the war ended. Twenty years later, interest payments on the war debt plus veterans’ pensions still accounted for almost two-thirds of the federal budget.

**The War Changes Lives**

The war not only impacted the nation’s economy and politics, it also changed individual lives. Perhaps the biggest change came for African Americans.

**NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM** The Emancipation Proclamation, which Lincoln had issued under his war powers, freed only those slaves who lived in the states that were behind Confederate lines and not yet under Union control. The government had to decide what to do about the border states, where slavery was still legal.

The president believed that the only solution would be a constitutional amendment abolishing slavery. The Republican-controlled Senate approved an amendment in the summer of 1864, but the House, with its large Democratic membership, did not. After Lincoln’s reelection, the amendment was reintroduced in the House in January of 1865. This time the administration convinced a few Democrats to vote in its favor with promises of government jobs after they left office. The amendment passed with two votes to spare. Spectators—many of them African Americans who were now allowed to sit in the congressional galleries—burst into cheers, while Republicans on the floor shouted in triumph.

By year’s end 27 states, including 8 from the South, had ratified the **Thirteenth Amendment**. The U.S. Constitution now stated that “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States.”
The Civil War marked the first time in United States history that photography, a resource since 1839, played a major role in a military conflict. Hundreds of photographers traveled with the troops, working both privately and for the military. The most famous Civil War photographer was Mathew Brady, who employed about 20 photographers to meet the public demand for pictures from the battlefront. This was the beginning of American news photography, or photojournalism.

Many of Brady’s photographs are a mix of realism and artificiality. Due to the primitive level of photographic technology, subjects had to be carefully posed and remain still during the long exposure times.

In this 1864 photograph Brady posed a kneeling soldier, offering a canteen of water, beside a wounded soldier with his arm in a sling. Images like this, showing the wounded or the dead, brought home the harsh reality of war to the civilian population.

“Encampment of the Army of the Potomac” (May 1862). Few photographs of the Civil War are as convincing in their naturalism as this view over a Union encampment. Simply by positioning the camera behind the soldiers, the photographer draws the viewer into the composition. Although we cannot see the soldiers’ faces, we are compelled to see through their eyes.

SKILLBUILDER  Interpreting Visual Sources
1. What elements in the smaller photograph seem posed or contrived? What elements are more realistic?
2. How do these photographs compare with more heroic imagery of traditional history painting?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R23.
CIVILIANS FOLLOW NEW PATHS After the war ended, those who had served—Northerners and Southerners alike—had to find new directions for their lives.

Some war leaders continued their military careers, while others returned to civilian life. William Tecumseh Sherman remained in the army and spent most of his time fighting Native Americans in the West. Robert E. Lee lost Arlington, his plantation, which the Secretary of War of the Union had turned into a cemetery for Union dead. Lee became president of Washington College in Virginia, now known as Washington and Lee University. Lee swore renewed allegiance to the United States, but Congress accidentally neglected to restore his citizenship (until 1975). Still, Lee never spoke bitterly of Northerners or the Union.

Many veterans returned to their small towns and farms after the war. Others, as Grant noted, “found they were not satisfied with the farm, the store, or the workshop of the villages, but wanted larger fields.” Many moved to the burgeoning cities or went west in search of opportunity.

Others tried to turn their wartime experience to good. The horrors that Union nurse Clara Barton witnessed during the war inspired her to spend her life helping others. In 1869, Barton went to Europe to rest and recuperate from her work during the war. She became involved in the activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross during the Franco-Prussian War. Returning to the United States, Barton helped found the American Red Cross in 1881.

THE ASSASSINATION OF LINCOLN Whatever plans Lincoln had to reunify the nation after the war, he never got to implement them. On April 14, 1865, five days after Lee surrendered to Grant at Appomattox Court House, Lincoln and his wife went to Ford’s Theatre in Washington to see a British comedy, Our American Cousin. During the play’s third act, a man silently opened the unguarded doors to the presidential box. He crept up behind Lincoln, raised a pistol, and fired, hitting the president in the back of the head.

The assassin, John Wilkes Booth—a 26-year-old actor and Southern sympathizer—then leaped down to the stage. In doing so, he caught his spur on one of the flags draped across the front of the box. Booth landed hard on his left leg and broke it. He rose and said something that the audience had trouble understanding. Some thought it was the state motto of Virginia, “Sic semper tyrannis”—in English “Thus be it ever to tyrants.” Others thought he said, “The South is avenged!” Then he limped offstage into the wings.

Despite a broken leg, Booth managed to escape. Twelve days later, Union cavalry trapped him in a Virginia tobacco barn, and set the building on fire. When Booth still refused to surrender, a shot was fired. He may have been shot by cavalry or by himself, but the cavalry dragged him out. Booth is said to have whispered, “Tell my mother I died for my country. I did what I thought was best.” His last words were “Useless, useless.”

After Lincoln was shot, he remained unconscious through the night. He died at 7:22 a.m. the following morning, April 15. It was the first time a president of the United States had been assassinated. Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles recorded the public’s immediate reactions in his diary.
A PERSONAL VOICE
GIDEON WELLES

“... It was a dark and gloomy morning, and rain set in. ... On the Avenue in front of the White House were several hundred colored people, mostly women and children, weeping and wailing their loss. This crowd did not appear to diminish through the whole of that cold, wet day; they seemed not to know what was to be their fate since their great benefactor was dead, and their hope-less grief affected me more than almost anything else, though strong and brave men wept when I met them.”

—quoted in Voices from the Civil War

The funeral train that carried Lincoln’s body from Washington to his hometown of Springfield, Illinois, took 14 days for its journey. Approximately 7 million Americans, or almost one-third of the entire Union population, turned out to publicly mourn the martyred leader.

The Civil War had ended. Slavery and secession were no more. Now the country faced two different problems: how to restore the Southern states to the Union and how to integrate approximately 4 million newly freed African Americans into national life.

1. TERMS & NAMES
For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.
- National Bank Act
- Thirteenth Amendment
- Red Cross
- John Wilkes Booth

2. MAIN IDEA

3. CRITICAL THINKING

3. HYPOTHESIMIZING
Imagine that you are a member of a group of Southern leaders who must rebuild the South after the war. What would you recommend that the government do to help the South?
Think About:
- the economic devastation of the South
- the human costs of the war
- the numbers of newly freed slaves

4. ANALYZING ISSUES
What political and social issues from the Civil War era do you think are still issues today? Use details from the text to support your answer.

5. SYNTHESIZING
Write three questions that you have about the lives of African Americans after the Civil War.
VISUAL SUMMARY

THE CIVIL WAR

LONG-TERM CAUSES
• Conflict over slavery in territories
• Economic differences between North and South
• Conflict between states’ rights and federal control

IMMEDIATE CAUSES
• Election of Lincoln
• Secession of southern states
• Firing on Fort Sumter

IMMEDIATE EFFECTS
• Abolition of slavery
• Widening gap between economies of North and South
• Physical devastation of the South
• Reunification of the country

LONG-TERM EFFECTS
• Reconstruction of the South
• Industrial boom
• Increased federal authority

TERMS & NAMES
For each term or name below, write a sentence explaining its connection to the Civil War.

1. Ulysses S. Grant
2. Robert E. Lee
3. Emancipation Proclamation
4. conscription
5. income tax
6. Andersonville
7. Gettysburg Address
8. Appomattox Court House
9. Thirteenth Amendment
10. John Wilkes Booth

MAIN IDEAS
Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

The Civil War Begins (pages 338–345)
1. What were the military strategies of the North and South at the outset of the Civil War?
2. What advantages did the North have over the South?

The Politics of War (pages 346–350)
3. How did different groups react to the Emancipation Proclamation? Give examples.

Life During Wartime (pages 351–356)
4. What acts of protest occurred in both the North and South?

The North Takes Charge (pages 357–365)
5. In what ways did the South’s morale deteriorate?
6. What was Grant and Sherman’s rationale for using the strategy of total war?

The Legacy of the War (pages 366–371)
7. How did the Civil War provide the economic foundation for the United States to become an industrial giant?

CRITICAL THINKING
1. USING YOUR NOTES On a continuum like the one shown, mark where Abraham Lincoln’s and Jefferson Davis’s policies would fall. Support your ratings with evidence from the text.

```
\[ \text{less federal control} \rightarrow \text{more federal control} \]
```

2. ANALYZING PRIMARY SOURCES Poet Walt Whitman made the following observation about Lincoln.

“He leaves for America’s history and biography, so far, not only its most dramatic reminiscence—he leaves, in my opinion, the greatest . . . personality. . . By many has this Union been . . . help’d; but if one name, one man, must be pick’d out, he, most of all, is the conservator of it, to the future. He was assassinated—but the Union is not assassinated.”

—Walt Whitman, Specimen Days

Do you agree or disagree about Lincoln’s legacy? Explain why.

3. INTERPRETING MAPS Compare the maps on pages 340–341 and 363. What do they tell you about the progress of the Civil War from 1861–1865? Explain your answer.
1. According to the cartoon, President Lincoln’s “two difficulties” are how to —
   A pay government salaries and build support in Congress.
   B reduce taxes and find good generals.
   C avoid bankruptcy and stop the draft riots.
   D finance the war and find enough soldiers to fight.

2. What technological advance contributed most to the Civil War’s high casualty rate?
   F the ironclad ship
   G the minié ball
   H the land mine
   J the camera

3. Which pair of events are listed in the order in which they occurred?
   A Battle of Gettysburg; Battle of Antietam
   B New York City draft riots; First Battle of Bull Run
   C Battle of Gettysburg; fall of Atlanta
   D First Battle of Bull Run; firing on Fort Sumter

4. Which of the following is not true of the South after the Civil War?
   F It held 30 percent of the national wealth.
   G Most of its industry was destroyed.
   H Its labor system was dismantled.
   J As much as 40 percent of its livestock was wiped out.

For additional test practice, go online for:
- Diagnostic tests
- Tutorials

INTERACT WITH HISTORY
Think about the issues you explored at the beginning of the chapter. In light of what you now know about the Civil War, consider whether the use of force can preserve a nation. Write a short editorial for an 1861 newspaper supporting or opposing the war. Discuss what might have happened if the North allowed the South to secede.

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING
Use the Internet to find Mary Chesnut’s diary of the Civil War. As a group, read several entries and discuss them. Then create three diary entries that Mary Chesnut might have written. Make sure the entries are in keeping with her personality and writing style. Each entry should refer to significant events, issues, or people of the Civil War. Share your group’s entries with the class.

FOCUS ON WRITING
Imagine that you are a U.S. citizen living during the Civil War, and the Emancipation Proclamation has just been issued. Decide whether you think the proclamation was effective. Write a letter to President Lincoln expressing your point of view.

The Civil War 373
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, was a sleepy agricultural town of about 2,400 residents when the Civil War arrived on its doorstep in the early summer of 1863. Many of the town’s men were elsewhere, either fighting in the war or guarding their livestock in the countryside. This left mostly women and children to endure the battle. For three terrifying days they hid in basements or in tightly shuttered houses. Even after the battle finally ended the horrors continued, as the Gettysburg civilians emerged to find a scene of unimaginable death and destruction. Explore some of the personal stories and recollections of the Gettysburg civilians online. You can find a wealth of information, video clips, primary sources, activities, and more at hmhsocialstudies.com.
“I had scarcely reached the front door, when, on looking up the street, I saw some of the men on horseback . . .
What a horrible sight! . . .
I was fully persuaded that the Rebels had actually come at last. What they would do with us was a fearful question to my young mind . . .”
— Tillie Pierce, age 15

A Young Woman’s Account
Read the document to witness the arrival of Confederate troops through the eyes of a Gettysburg teenager.

A Citizen-Soldier
Watch the video to meet John Burns, the man who would come to be called the “Citizen Hero of Gettysburg.”

A Family’s Story
Watch the video to discover the story of courage and commitment exhibited by one Gettysburg family.

The National Cemetery
Watch the video to learn about the Soldiers’ National Cemetery and the speech President Lincoln gave there.
Essential Question

What were the political struggles, accomplishments, and failures of Reconstruction in the years following the Civil War?

What You Will Learn

In this chapter you will learn about Reconstruction and the effects it had on the nation.

SECTION 1: The Politics of Reconstruction

Main Idea: Congress opposed Lincoln’s and Johnson’s plans for Reconstruction and instead implemented its own plan to rebuild the South.

SECTION 2: Reconstructing Society

Main Idea: Various groups contributed to the rebuilding of Southern society after the war.

SECTION 3: The Collapse of Reconstruction

Main Idea: Southern opposition to Radical Reconstruction, along with economic problems in the North, ended Reconstruction.

After the Civil War, Charleston, South Carolina, and other Southern cities lay in ruins.

USA

WORLD

1864

1865 Confederate surrenders at Appomattox.

1865 Andrew Johnson becomes president after Lincoln’s assassination.

1866 President Johnson presses for moderate Reconstruction policies.

1867 U.S. buys Alaska from Russia for $7.2 million.

1868 Congress impeaches President Johnson.

1868 Ulysses S. Grant is elected president.

1869 Mohandas K. Gandhi is born in India.
The year is 1865, and at last the Civil War is over. The South’s primary labor system, slavery, has been abolished. About 4.5 million African Americans now have their freedom but lack money, property, education, and opportunity. Southern states are beginning the process of readmission to the Union, but the effects of war continue to be felt throughout the South. Rail lines are unusable. Farms, plantations, and factories lie in ruins.

Explore the Issues
- How can Northern resources help the South?
- In what ways can the South rebuild its economy?
- What can the government do to assist African Americans?
As a young man, **Andrew Johnson**—who succeeded Abraham Lincoln as president—entered politics in Tennessee. He won several important offices, including those of congressman, governor, and U.S. senator.

After secession, Johnson was the only senator from a Confederate state to remain loyal to the Union. A former slave-owner, by 1863 Johnson supported abolition. He hated wealthy Southern planters, whom he held responsible for dragging poor whites into the war. Early in 1865, he endorsed harsh punishment for the rebellion’s leaders.

> **A Personal Voice**  
> **Andrew Johnson**  
> “The time has arrived when the American people should understand what crime is, and that it should be punished, and its penalties enforced and inflicted... Treason must be made odious... traitors must be punished and impoverished... their social power must be destroyed. I say, as to the leaders, punishment. I say leniency, conciliation, and amnesty to the thousands whom they have misled and deceived.”

—quoted in *Reconstruction: The Ending of the Civil War*

On becoming president, Johnson faced not only the issue of whether to punish or pardon former Confederates but also a larger problem: how to bring the defeated Confederate states back into the Union.

---

**Lincoln’s Plan for Reconstruction**

Reconstruction was the period during which the United States began to rebuild after the Civil War, lasting from 1865 to 1877. The term also refers to the process the federal government used to readmit the Confederate states. Complicating the process was the fact that Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, and Congress had differing ideas on how Reconstruction should be handled.
**LINCOLN’S TEN-PERCENT PLAN** Lincoln, before his death, had made it clear that he favored a lenient Reconstruction policy. Lincoln believed that secession was constitutionally impossible and therefore that the Confederate states had never left the Union. He contended that it was individuals, not states, who had rebelled and that the Constitution gave the president the power to pardon individuals. Lincoln wished to make the South’s return to the Union as quick and easy as possible.

In December 1863, President Lincoln announced his Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction, also known as the Ten-Percent Plan. The government would pardon all Confederates—except high-ranking Confederate officials and those accused of crimes against prisoners of war—who would swear allegiance to the Union. After ten percent of those on the 1860 voting lists took this oath of allegiance, a Confederate state could form a new state government and gain representation in Congress.

Under Lincoln’s terms, four states—Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Virginia—moved toward readmission to the Union. However, Lincoln’s moderate Reconstruction plan angered a minority of Republicans in Congress, known as Radical Republicans. Led by Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts and Representative Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania, the Radicals wanted to destroy the political power of former slaveholders. Most of all, they wanted African Americans to be given full citizenship and the right to vote. In 1865, the idea of African-American suffrage was truly radical; no other country that had abolished slavery had given former slaves the vote.

**RADICAL REACTION** In July 1864, the Radicals responded to the Ten-Percent Plan by passing the Wade-Davis Bill, which proposed that Congress, not the president, be responsible for Reconstruction. It also declared that for a state government to be formed, a majority—not just ten percent—of those eligible to vote in 1860 would have to take a solemn oath to support the Constitution.

Lincoln used a pocket veto to kill the Wade-Davis Bill after Congress adjourned. According to the Constitution, a president has ten days to either sign or veto a bill passed by Congress. If the president does neither, the bill will automatically become law. When a bill is passed less than ten days before the end of a congressional session, the president can prevent its becoming law by simply ignoring, or “pocketing,” it. The Radicals called Lincoln’s pocket veto an outrage and asserted that Congress had supreme authority over Reconstruction. The stage was set for a presidential-congressional showdown.

**Johnson’s Plan**

Lincoln’s assassination in April 1865 left his successor, the Democrat Andrew Johnson, to deal with the Reconstruction controversy. A staunch Unionist, Johnson had often expressed his intent to deal harshly with Confederate leaders. Most white Southerners therefore considered Johnson a traitor to his region, while Radicals believed that he was one of them. Both were wrong.
JOHNSON CONTINUES LINCOLN’S POLICIES  In May 1865, with Congress in recess, Johnson announced his own plan, Presidential Reconstruction. He declared that each remaining Confederate state—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas—could be readmitted to the Union if it would meet several conditions. Each state would have to withdraw its secession, swear allegiance to the Union, annul Confederate war debts, and ratify the Thirteenth Amendment, which abolished slavery.

To the dismay of Thaddeus Stevens and the Radicals, Johnson’s plan differed little from Lincoln’s. The one major difference was that Johnson wished to prevent most high-ranking Confederates and wealthy Southern landowners from taking the oath needed for voting privileges. The Radicals were especially upset that Johnson’s plan, like Lincoln’s, failed to address the needs of former slaves in three areas: land, voting rights, and protection under the law.

If Johnson’s policies angered Radicals, they relieved most white Southerners. Johnson’s support of states’ rights instead of a strong central government reassured the Southern states. Although Johnson supported abolition, he was not in favor of former slaves gaining the right to vote—he pardoned more than 13,000 former Confederates because he believed that “white men alone must manage the South.”

The remaining Confederate states quickly agreed to Johnson’s terms. Within a few months, these states—all except Texas—held conventions to draw up new state constitutions, to set up new state governments, and to elect representatives to Congress. However, some Southern states did not fully comply with the conditions for returning to the Union. For example, Mississippi did not ratify the Thirteenth Amendment.

Despite such instances of noncompliance, in December 1865, the newly elected Southern legislators arrived in Washington to take their seats. Fifty-eight of them had previously sat in the Congress of the Confederacy, six had served in the Confederate cabinet, and four had fought against the United States as Confederate generals. Johnson pardoned them all—a gesture that infuriated the Radicals and made African Americans feel they had been betrayed. In an 1865 editorial, an African-American newspaper publisher responded to Johnson’s actions.

A PERSONAL VOICE  PHILIP A. BELL

“If the war does not appear to us to be ended, nor rebellion suppressed. They have commenced reconstruction on disloyal principles. If rebel soldiers are allowed to mumble through oaths of allegiance, and vote Lee’s officers into important offices, and if Legislatures, elected by such voters, are allowed to define the provisions of the Amnesty Proclamation, then were our conquests vain. . . . Already we see the fruits of this failure on the part of Government to mete out full justice to the loyal blacks, and retribution to the disloyal whites.”

—quoted in Witness for Freedom: African American Voices on Race, Slavery, and Emancipation

PRESIDENTIAL RECONSTRUCTION COMES TO A STANDSTILL When the 39th Congress convened in December 1865, the Radical Republican legislators, led by Thaddeus Stevens, disputed Johnson’s claim that Reconstruction was complete. Many of them believed that the Southern states were not much different
from the way they had been before the war. As a result, Congress refused to admit the newly elected Southern legislators.

At the same time, moderate Republicans pushed for new laws to remedy weaknesses they saw in Johnson’s plan. In February 1866, Congress voted to continue and enlarge the Freedmen’s Bureau. The bureau, established by Congress in the last month of the war, assisted former slaves and poor whites in the South by distributing clothing and food. In addition, the Freedmen’s Bureau set up more than 40 hospitals, approximately 4,000 schools, 61 industrial institutes, and 74 teacher-training centers.

**CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1866** Two months later, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1866, which gave African Americans citizenship and forbade states from passing discriminatory laws—black codes—that severely restricted African Americans’ lives. Mississippi and South Carolina had first enacted black codes in 1865, and other Southern states had rapidly followed suit.

Black codes had the effect of restoring many of the restrictions of slavery by prohibiting blacks from carrying weapons, serving on juries, testifying against whites, marrying whites, and traveling without permits. In some states, African Americans were forbidden to own land. Even worse, in many areas resentful whites used violence to keep blacks from improving their position in society. To many members of Congress, the passage of black codes indicated that the South had not given up the idea of keeping African Americans in bondage.

Johnson shocked everyone when he vetoed both the Freedmen’s Bureau Act and the Civil Rights Act. Congress, Johnson contended, had gone far beyond anything “contemplated by the authors of the Constitution.” These vetoes proved to be the opening shots in a battle between the president and Congress. By rejecting the two acts, Johnson alienated the moderate Republicans who were trying to improve his Reconstruction plan. He also angered the Radicals by appearing to support Southerners who denied African Americans their full rights. Johnson had not been in office a year when presidential Reconstruction ground to a halt.

**Congressional Reconstruction**

Angered by Johnson’s actions, radical and moderate Republican factions decided to work together to shift the control of the Reconstruction process from the executive branch to the legislature, beginning a period of “congressional Reconstruction.”

**MODERATES AND RADICALS JOIN FORCES** In mid-1866, moderate Republicans joined with Radicals to override the president’s vetoes of the Civil Rights and Freedmen’s Bureau acts. The Civil Rights Act of 1866 became the first major legislation ever enacted over a presidential veto. In addition, Congress drafted the Fourteenth Amendment, which provided a constitutional basis for the Civil Rights Act.

The Fourteenth Amendment made “all persons born or naturalized in the United States” citizens of the country. All were entitled to equal protection of the law, and no state could deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due
process of law. The amendment did not specifically give African Americans the vote. However, it did specify that if any state prevented a portion of its male citizens from voting, that state would lose a percentage of its congressional seats equal to the percentage of citizens kept from the polls. Another provision barred most Confederate leaders from holding federal or state offices unless they were permitted to do so by a two-thirds-majority vote of Congress.

Congress adopted the Fourteenth Amendment and sent it to the states for approval. If the Southern states had voted to ratify it, most Northern legislators and their constituents would have been satisfied to accept them back into the Union. President Johnson, however, believed that the amendment treated former Confederate leaders too harshly and that it was wrong to force states to accept an amendment that their legislators had no part in drafting. Therefore, he advised the Southern states to reject the amendment. All but Tennessee did reject it, and the amendment was not ratified until 1868.

1866 CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS The question of who should control Reconstruction became one of the central issues in the bitter 1866 congressional elections. Johnson, accompanied by General Ulysses S. Grant, went on a speaking tour, urging voters to elect representatives who agreed with his Reconstruction policy. But his train trip from Washington to St. Louis and Chicago and back was a disaster. Johnson offended many voters with his rough language and behavior. His audiences responded by jeering at him and cheering Grant.

In addition, race riots in Memphis, Tennessee, and New Orleans, Louisiana, caused the deaths of at least 80 African Americans. Such violence convinced Northern voters that the federal government must step in to protect former slaves. In the 1866 elections, moderate and Radical Republicans won a landslide victory over Democrats. The Republicans gained a two-thirds majority in Congress, ensuring them the numbers they needed to override presidential vetoes. By March 1867, the 40th Congress was ready to move ahead with its Reconstruction policy.

RECONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1867 Radicals and moderates joined in passing the Reconstruction Act of 1867, which did not recognize state governments formed under the Lincoln and Johnson plans—except for that of Tennessee, which had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment and had been readmitted to the Union. The act divided the other ten former Confederate states into five military districts, each headed by a Union general. The voters in the districts—including African-American men—would elect delegates to conventions in which new state
constitutions would be drafted. In order for a state to reenter the Union, its constitution had to ensure African-American men the vote, and the state had to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment.

Johnson vetoed the Reconstruction Act of 1867 because he believed it was in conflict with the Constitution. Congress promptly overrode the veto.

**JOHNSON IMPEACHED** Radical leaders felt President Johnson was not carrying out his constitutional obligation to enforce the Reconstruction Act. For instance, Johnson removed military officers who attempted to enforce the act. The Radicals looked for grounds on which to impeach the president—that is, to formally charge him with misconduct in office. The House of Representatives has the sole power to impeach federal officials, who are then tried in the Senate.

In March 1867, Congress had passed the Tenure of Office Act, which stated that the president could not remove cabinet officers “during the term of the president by whom they may have been appointed” without the consent of the Senate. One purpose of this act was to protect Secretary of War Edwin Stanton, the Radicals’ ally.

Johnson, along with many others, was certain that the Tenure of Office Act was unconstitutional. To force a court test of the act, Johnson fired Secretary of War Stanton. His action provided the Radicals with the opportunity they needed—the House brought 11 charges of impeachment against Johnson, 9 of which were based on his violation of the Tenure of Office Act. Johnson’s lawyers disputed these charges by pointing out that President Lincoln, not Johnson, had appointed Secretary Stanton, so the act did not apply.

Johnson’s trial before the Senate took place from March to May 1868. On the day the final vote was taken at the trial, tension...
mounted in the jammed Senate galleries. Would the Radicals get the two-thirds vote needed for conviction? People in the Senate chamber held their breath as one by one the senators gave their verdicts. When the last senator declared “Not guilty,” the vote was 35 to 19, one short of the two-thirds majority needed.

**ULYSSES S. GRANT ELECTED** The Democrats knew that they could not win the 1868 presidential election with Johnson, so they nominated the wartime governor of New York, Horatio Seymour. Seymour’s Republican opponent was the Civil War hero Ulysses S. Grant. In November, Grant won the presidency by a wide margin in the electoral college, but the popular vote was less decisive. Out of almost 6 million ballots cast, Grant received a majority of only 306,592 votes. About 500,000 Southern African Americans had voted, most of them for Grant, bringing home the importance of the African-American vote to the Republican Party.

After the election, the Radicals feared that pro-Confederate Southern whites might try to limit black suffrage. Therefore, the Radicals introduced the **Fifteenth Amendment**, which states that no one can be kept from voting because of “race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” The amendment would also affect Northern states, many of which at this time barred African Americans from voting.

The Fifteenth Amendment, which was ratified by the states in 1870, was an important victory for the Radicals. Some Southern governments refused to enforce the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, and some white Southerners used violence to prevent African Americans from voting. In response, Congress passed the Enforcement Act of 1870, giving the federal government more power to punish those who tried to prevent African Americans from exercising their rights.

Such political achievements were not, however, the only changes taking place during Reconstruction. The period was also a time of profound social and economic changes in the South.

---

**ASSESSMENT**

1. **TERMS & NAMES** For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.

- Andrew Johnson
- Reconstruction
- Radical Republicans
- Thaddeus Stevens
- Wade-Davis Bill
- Freedmen’s Bureau
- black codes
- Fourteenth Amendment
- Fifteenth Amendment
- impeach
- Fifteenth Amendment

---

2. **TAKING NOTES** Fill in a chart like the one shown with features of presidential Reconstruction and congressional Reconstruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Reconstruction</th>
<th>Congressional Reconstruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Why did presidential Reconstruction fail?

---

3. **HYPOTHEORIZING** Describe how Reconstruction might have been different if Abraham Lincoln had lived.

---

4. **INTERPRETING CHARTS** Look again at the chart on page 380. What was the primary focus of the major Reconstruction legislation?

---

5. **EVALUATING DECISIONS** Do you think the Radical Republicans were justified in impeaching President Johnson? Why or why not? **Think About:**

- the controversy over Reconstruction policies
- the meaning of the Tenure of Office Act
- Johnson’s vetoes
Reconstructing Society

MAIN IDEA
Various groups contributed to the rebuilding of Southern society after the war.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW
Many African-American institutions, including colleges and churches, were established during Reconstruction.

Terms & Names
- scalawags
- carpetbaggers
- Hiram Revels
- sharecroppers
- tenant farming

One American's Story

Robert G. Fitzgerald, an African American, was born free in Delaware in 1840. During the Civil War, he served in both the U.S. Army and the U.S. Navy. In 1866, the Freedmen’s Bureau sent Fitzgerald to teach in a small Virginia town. His students were former slaves of all ages who were hungry to learn reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, and geography.

A PERSONAL VOICE

"I came to Virginia one year ago on the 22nd of this month. Erected a school, organized and named the Freedman’s Chapel School. Now (June 29th) have about 60 who have been for several months engaged in the study of arithmetic, writing, etc. etc. This morning sent in my report accompanied with compositions from about 12 of my advanced writers instructed from the Alphabet up to their [present] condition, their progress has been surprisingly rapid."

—quoted in Proud Shoes

Fitzgerald was one of many who labored diligently against the illiteracy and poverty that slavery had forced upon most African Americans. The need to help former slaves, however, was just one of many issues the nation confronted during Reconstruction.

Conditions in the Postwar South

Under the congressional Reconstruction program, state constitutional conventions met and Southern voters elected new, Republican-dominated governments. In 1868, the former Confederate states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and South Carolina reentered the Union (joining Tennessee, which had reentered earlier). The remaining four former Confederate states completed the process by 1870. However, even after all the states were back in the Union, the Republicans did not end the process of Reconstruction because they wanted to make economic changes in the South.
Clearing battlefields of human remains was just one of many tasks facing Reconstruction governments.

PHYSICAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS Because the Civil War was fought mostly on Southern soil, many of the new Southern state governments faced the challenge of physically rebuilding a battle-scarred region. The Union general William T. Sherman estimated that his troops alone had destroyed about $100 million worth of Confederate property in Georgia and South Carolina. Charred buildings, twisted railroad tracks, demolished bridges, neglected roads, and abandoned farms had to be restored or replaced.

The economic effects of the war were devastating for the South. Property values had plummeted. Those who had invested in Confederate bonds had little hope of recovering their money. Many small farms were ruined or in disrepair. As a result of these and other factors, Southerners of every economic class were poorer than they had been at the start of the war. In one county of Alabama, for example, the wealth per capita among whites dropped from $18,000 in 1860 to about $3,000 in 1870.

Not only were many of the South’s economic resources destroyed, but the region’s population was devastated. More than one-fifth of the adult white men of the Confederacy died in the war. Many of those who did return from battle were maimed for life. Tens of thousands of Southern African-American men also died, either fighting for the Union or working in Confederate labor camps.

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS The Republican governments built roads, bridges, and railroads and established orphanages and institutions for the care of the mentally ill and disabled. They also created the first public school systems that most Southern states had ever had.

These ambitious projects—and the larger state governments that were required to administer them—were expensive. Few financial resources were available, and Northern capitalists were reluctant to invest in the region. To raise money, most Southern state governments increased taxes of all kinds, draining existing resources and slowing the region’s recovery.
Another difficulty facing the new Republican governments was that different groups within the Republican Party in the South often had conflicting goals.

**SCALAWAGS AND CARPETBAGGERS** Although the terms *scalawag* and *carpetbagger* were negative labels imposed by political enemies, historians still use the terms when referring to the two groups. Democrats, opposed to the Republicans’ plan for Reconstruction, called white Southerners who joined the Republican Party *scalawags*. Some scalawags hoped to gain political offices with the help of the African-American vote and then use those offices to enrich themselves. Southern Democrats unfairly pointed to these unscrupulous individuals as representative of all white Southern Republicans. Some so-called scalawags honestly thought that a Republican government offered the best chances for the South to rebuild and industrialize. The majority were small farmers who wanted to improve their economic and political position and to prevent the former wealthy planters from regaining power.

The Democrats used an equally unflattering name for the Northerners who moved to the South after the war—*carpetbaggers*. The name referred to the belief that Northerners arrived with so few belongings that everything could fit in a carpetbag, a small piece of luggage made of carpeting. Most white Southerners believed that the carpetbaggers wanted to exploit the South’s postwar turmoil for their own profit. However, like the scalawags, carpetbaggers had mixed motives. Some were Freedmen’s Bureau agents, teachers, and ministers who felt a moral duty to help former slaves. Others wanted to buy land or hoped to start new industries legitimately. Still others truly were the dishonest businesspeople whom the Southerners scorned.

**MAIN IDEA**

**Comparing**

What were some similarities in the goals of scalawags and carpetbaggers? of carpetbaggers and African Americans?

---

**UNWELCOME GUEST**

Of all the political cartoonists of the 19th century, Thomas Nast (1840–1902) had the greatest and most long-lasting influence. Nast created symbols that have become part of America’s visual heritage, symbols that include the Democratic donkey, the Republican elephant, and Santa Claus.

This cartoon from a Southern Democratic newspaper depicts Carl Schurz, a liberal Republican who advocated legal equality for African Americans. Schurz is shown as a carpetbagger trudging down a dusty Southern road as a crowd of people watch his arrival.

**SKILLBUILDER** Analyzing Political Cartoons

1. Is Schurz shown in a positive or negative light? How can you tell?
2. Why do you think the cartoonist portrays the Southern people standing in a group, far away from Schurz?

AFRICAN AMERICANS AS VOTERS

African Americans—who made up the largest group of Southern Republicans—gained voting rights as a result of the Fifteenth Amendment. During Reconstruction, African-American men registered to vote for the first time; nine out of ten of them supported the Republican Party. Although most former slaves had little experience with politics, and relatively few could read and write, they were eager to exercise their voting rights.

A PERSONAL VOICE

WILLIAM BEVERLY NASH

"We are not prepared for this suffrage. But we can learn. Give a man tools and let him commence to use them and in time he will earn a trade. So it is with voting. We may not understand it at the start, but in time we shall learn to do our duty."

—quoted in The Trouble They Seen: Black People Tell the Story of Reconstruction

In many areas of the South, almost 90 percent of the qualified African-American voters voted. Early in 1868, a Northerner in Alabama observed that “in defiance of fatigue, hardship, hunger, and threats of employers,” African Americans still flocked to the polls.

POLITICAL DIFFERENCES

Conflicting goals among Republican Party members led to disunity in the party’s ranks. In particular, few scalawags shared the Republican commitment to civil rights and suffrage for African Americans. Over time, many of them returned to the Democratic Party.

In addition, some Republican governors began to appoint white Democrats to office in an attempt to persuade more white voters to vote Republican. This policy backfired—it convinced very few white Democrats to change parties, and it made blacks feel betrayed.

The new status of African Americans required fundamental changes in the attitudes of most Southern whites. Some whites supported the Republicans during Reconstruction and thought that the end of slavery would ultimately benefit the South. In addition, some Southern farmers and merchants thought that investment by Northerners would help the South recover from the war. Many white Southerners, though, refused to accept blacks’ new status and resisted the idea of equal rights. A Freedmen’s Bureau agent noted that some “Southern whites are quite indignant if they are not treated with the same deference as they were accustomed to” under the system of slavery.

Moreover, white Southerners had to accept defeat and the day-to-day involvement of Northerners in their lives. Eva B. Jones, the wife of a former Confederate officer, understood how difficult that adjustment was for many. In a letter to her mother-in-law, she expressed emotions that were typical of those felt by many ex-Confederates.
Former Slaves Face Many Challenges

Amid the turmoil of the South during Reconstruction, African Americans looked forward to new opportunities. Slaves had been forbidden to travel without permission, to marry legally, to attend school, and to live and work as they chose. After the war, the 4 million former slaves gained the chance to take control of their lives.

NEW-WON FREEDOMS At first, many former slaves were cautious about testing the limits of their freedom. One freedman explained, “We was afraid to move. Just like . . . turtles after emancipation. Just stick our heads out to see how the land lay." As the reality of freedom sank in, freed African Americans faced many decisions. Without land, jobs, tools, money, and with few skills besides those of farming, what were they to do? How would they feed and clothe themselves? How and where would they live?

During slavery, slaves were forbidden to travel without a pass. White planters had enforced that rule by patrolling the roads. During Reconstruction, African Americans took advantage of their new freedom to go where they wanted. One former slave from Texas explained the passion for traveling: “They seemed to want to get closer to freedom, so they’d know what it was—like it was a place or a city.”

The majority of freed African Americans who moved, however, were not just testing their freedom. Thousands were eager to leave plantations that they associated with oppression and move to Southern towns and cities where they could find jobs. From 1865 to 1870, the African-American population of the ten largest Southern cities doubled.

REUNIFICATION OF FAMILIES Slavery had split many African-American families apart; spouses sometimes lived on different plantations, and children were often separated from their parents. During Reconstruction, many freed African Americans took advantage of their new mobility to search for loved ones. In 1865, for example, one man walked more than 600 miles from Georgia to North Carolina, looking for his wife and children.
Among former slaves, younger generations sometimes helped educate their elders. A young woman in Mt. Meigs, Alabama, teaches her mother to read.

The Freedmen’s Bureau worked to reunite families, and African-American newspapers printed poignant “Information Wanted” notices about missing relatives. Tragically, in many cases the lost family members were never found. However, freed persons, who had been denied legal unions under slavery, could now marry legally, and raise children without the fear that someone would sell them. For African Americans, reconstructing their families was an important part of establishing an identity as a free people.

**EDUCATION** Because slaves had been punished if they tried to learn how to read and write, nearly 80 percent of freed African Americans over the age of 20 were illiterate in 1870. During Reconstruction, however, freed people of all ages—grandparents, parents, and children alike—sought education.

African Americans established educational institutions with assistance from a number of public and private organizations, including the Freedmen’s Bureau and African-American churches. One college founded during Reconstruction was Hampton Institute in Hampton, Virginia. By 1870, African Americans had spent more than $1 million on education. Initially, most teachers in black schools were Northern whites, about half of whom were women. However, educated African Americans like Robert G. Fitzgerald also became teachers, and by 1869, black teachers outnumbered whites in these schools.

Some white Southerners, outraged by the idea of educated African Americans, responded violently. In one instance, the former slave Washington Eager was murdered because, as his brother explained, he had become “too big a man . . . he [could] write and read and put it down himself.” Despite the threat of violence, freed people were determined to learn. By 1877, more than 600,000 African Americans were enrolled in elementary schools.

**CHURCHES AND VOLUNTEER GROUPS**

During slavery many plantation slaves had attended white churches and camp meetings with their owners. Resenting the preachers who urged them to obey their masters, the slaves had also held their own religious gatherings called “praise meetings.”

After the war many African Americans founded their own churches, which were usually Baptist or Methodist, and held services similar to the earlier praise meetings. Because churches were the principal institutions that African Americans fully controlled, African-American ministers emerged as influential community leaders. They often played an important role in the broader political life of the country as well.
Besides organizing their own schools and churches, freed African Americans formed thousands of volunteer organizations. They established their own fire companies, trade associations, political organizations, and drama groups, to name just a few. These groups not only fostered independence but also provided financial and emotional support for their members, while offering African Americans opportunities to gain the leadership skills that slavery had often denied them.

**POLITICS AND AFRICAN AMERICANS** The period from 1865 to 1877 saw growing African-American involvement in politics at all levels. For the first time, African Americans held office in local, state, and federal government. At first, most African Americans in politics were freeborn. Many of these black officeholders were ministers or teachers who had been educated in the North. By 1867, however, former slaves were playing an increasing role in political organizations and were winning a greater number of offices.

Nevertheless, even though there were almost as many black citizens as white citizens in the South, African-American officeholders remained in the minority. Only South Carolina had a black majority in the state legislature. No Southern state elected an African-American governor. Moreover, out of 125 Southerners elected to the U.S. Congress during congressional Reconstruction, only 16 were African Americans. Among these was **Hiram Revels**, the first African-American senator.

**LAWS AGAINST SEGREGATION** By the end of 1866, most of the Republican Southern state governments had repealed the black codes. African-American legislators took social equality a step further by proposing bills to desegregate public transportation. In 1871, Texas passed a law prohibiting railroads from making distinctions between groups of passengers, and several other states followed suit. However, many antisegregation laws were not enforced. State orphanages, for example, usually had separate facilities for white and black children.

African Americans themselves focused more on building up the black community than on total integration. By establishing separate African-American institutions—such as schools, churches, and political and social organizations—they were able to focus on African-American leadership and escape the interference of the whites who had so long dominated their lives.

**Changes in the Southern Economy**

When asked to explain the idea of freedom, Garrison Frazier, a former slave turned Baptist minister, said that freedom consisted in “placing us where we could reap the fruit of our own labor.” To accomplish this, Frazier said, freed African Americans needed “to have land, and turn it and till it.” Few former slaves, however, had enough money to buy land, and those who did have cash were frequently frustrated by whites’ refusal to sell property to them.
40 ACRES AND A MULE In January 1865, during the Civil War, General Sherman had promised the freed slaves who followed his army 40 acres per family and the use of army mules. Soon afterward, about 40,000 freed persons settled on 400,000 abandoned or forfeited acres in coastal Georgia and South Carolina. The freed African Americans farmed their plots until August 1865, when President Johnson ordered that the original landowners be allowed to reclaim their land and evict the former slaves.

Many freed African Americans asserted that they deserved part of the planters’ land. An Alabama black convention declared, “The property which they hold was nearly all earned by the sweat of our brows.” Some Radical Republicans agreed. Thaddeus Stevens called for the government to confiscate plantations and to redistribute part of the land to former slaves. However, many Republicans considered it wrong to seize citizens’ private property. As a result, Congress either rejected land-reform proposals or passed weak legislation. An example was the 1866 Southern Homestead Act. Although it set aside 44 million acres in the South for freed blacks and loyal whites, the land was swampy and unsuitable for farming. Furthermore, few homesteaders had the resources—seed, tools, plows, and horses—to farm successfully.

RESTORATION OF PLANTATIONS Although African Americans and poor whites wanted to own small farms, the planter class wanted to restore the plantation system, in which many acres were devoted to a single profitable cash crop, such as cotton. Some wealthy Northern merchants and owners of textile mills encouraged the planters in their efforts to reestablish plantations and resume widespread cotton production.

Planters claimed that to make the plantation system work, they needed to have almost complete control over their laborers.

Before the abolition of slavery, planters had forced young and old and men and women to work in the fields for extremely long hours. Now the planters feared that they might not be able to make a profit, since they had to pay their laborers and could no longer force field hands to put in such brutally long workdays. In addition, many former slaveholders deeply resented having to negotiate for the services of former slaves.

Planters also faced a labor shortage, caused by a number of factors. The high death toll of the war had reduced the number of able-bodied workers. Many African-American women and children refused to work in the fields after they were freed. Finally, many freed persons felt that raising cotton under the direction of white overseers was too much like slavery.

As an alternative, some former slaves worked in mills or on railroad-construction crews. Others tried subsistence farming—growing just enough food for their own families. To stop this trend, white planters were determined to keep the former slaves from getting land that they could use to support themselves.
SHARECROPPING AND TENANT FARMING

Without their own land, freed African Americans could not grow crops to sell or to feed their families. Economic necessity thus forced many former slaves to sign labor contracts with planters. In exchange for wages, housing, and food, freedmen worked in the fields. Although the Freedmen’s Bureau promoted this wage-labor system, the arrangement did not satisfy either freedmen or planters. On the one hand, freedmen thought that the wages were too low and that white employers had too much control over them. On the other hand, planters often lacked sufficient cash to pay workers. These conditions led planters and laborers to experiment with two alternative arrangements: sharecropping and tenant farming.

In the system of sharecropping, landowners divided their land and gave each worker—either freed African American or poor white—a few acres, along with seed and tools. At harvest time, each worker gave a share of his crop, usually half, to the landowner. This share paid the owner back and ended the arrangement until it was renewed the following year.

In theory, “croppers” who saved a little and bought their own tools could drive a better bargain with landowners. They might even rent land for cash from the planters, and keep all their harvest, in a system known as tenant farming. Eventually they might move up the economic ladder to become outright owners of their farms.

**SHARECROPPING**

A sharecropper works a Georgia cotton field in 1870.

**A CYCLE OF POVERTY**

Sharecroppers were supposed to have a chance to climb the economic ladder, but by the time they had shared their crops and paid their debts, they rarely had any money left. A sharecropper often became tied to one plantation, having no choice but to work until his or her debts were paid.
The arrangement seldom worked that way in practice, however. Most tenant farmers bought their supplies on credit, often from merchants who charged them inflated prices. Farmers rarely harvested enough crops to pay for both past debts and future supplies. The end result was that very few farmers saved enough cash to buy land.

**COTTON NO LONGER KING** Another economic change turned Southern agriculture upside down: cotton was no longer king. During the war, demand for Southern cotton had begun to drop as other countries increased their cotton production. As a result, prices plummeted after the war. In 1869, the price of cotton was 16.5 cents per pound. By the late 1870s, the price had fallen to about 8 cents per pound. Instead of diversifying—or varying—their crops, Southern planters tried to make up for the lower prices by growing more cotton—an oversupply that only drove down prices even further.

The South’s agricultural problems did lead to attempts to diversify the region’s economy. Textile mills sprang up, and a new industry—tobacco-product manufacturing—took hold. Diversification helped raise the average wage in the South, though it was still much lower than that of Northern workers.

At the end of the Civil War, most of the state banks in the South were saddled with Confederate debts—loans made to the Confederate government. The banks awaited repayment that, in most cases, would never come. In the following years, falling cotton prices and mounting planters’ debts caused many banks to fail. The only credit that Southerners in rural areas could get was that offered by local merchants. Despite efforts to improve the Southern economy, the devastating economic impact of the Civil War rippled through Southern life into the 20th century.

Many whites, frustrated by their loss of political power and by the South’s economic stagnation, took out their anger on African Americans. In the late 1860s and early 1870s, certain white groups embarked on a campaign to terrorize African Americans into giving up their political rights and their efforts at economic improvement.

---

**Main Idea**

1. **Terms & Names** For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.
   - scalawag
   - carpetbagger
   - Hiram Revels
   - sharecropping
   - tenant farming

**Critical Thinking**

2. **Taking Notes**
   In a chart like the one shown, list five problems facing the South after the Civil War and at least one attempted solution for each one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Attempted Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. **Forming Generalizations**
   How did the Civil War weaken the Southern economy? Give examples to support your answer.

4. **Analyzing Issues**
   Thaddeus Stevens believed that giving land to former slaves was more important than giving them the vote. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

5. **Evaluating**
   Which accomplishment of African Americans during Reconstruction do you consider most significant? Explain your choice. **Think About:**
   - the development of a free African-American community
   - the lingering effects of slavery
   - opportunities for leadership
The Collapse of Reconstruction

**MAIN IDEA**
Southern opposition to Radical Reconstruction, along with economic problems in the North, ended Reconstruction.

**WHY IT MATTERS NOW**
The failure of Congress and the Supreme Court to protect the rights of African Americans during Reconstruction delayed blacks’ achievement of full civil rights by over a century.

**Terms & Names**
- Ku Klux Klan (KKK)
- panic of 1873
- redemption
- Rutherford B. Hayes
- Samuel J. Tilden
- Compromise of 1877
- home rule

In 1868, white Georgia legislators, who were in the majority in both houses, expelled 27 black members of the state senate and House of Representatives. The new state constitution gave African Americans the right to vote, they argued, but not to hold office. Outraged by this expulsion, Henry M. Turner, an African-American legislator, addressed the Georgia House of Representatives.

**A PERSONAL VOICE** HENRY M. TURNER

“Whose Legislature is this? Is it a white man’s Legislature or is it a black man’s . . . ? . . . It is said that Congress never gave us the right to hold office. I want to know . . . if the Reconstruction measures did not base their action on the ground that no distinction should be made on account of race, color or previous condition! . . . We have built up your country. We have worked in your fields, and garnered your harvests, for two hundred and fifty years! Do we ask you for compensation? . . . We are willing to let the dead past bury its dead; but we ask you, now, for our RIGHTS.”

—quoted in *The Trouble They Seen: Black People Tell the Story of Reconstruction*

The expelled legislators petitioned the U.S. Congress and were eventually reinstated in office. But by the time Congress acted, more than a year later, the terms of Turner and his colleagues were almost at an end.

**Opposition to Reconstruction**

White Southerners who took direct action against African-American participation in government were in the minority. Most white Southerners swallowed whatever resentment they felt over African Americans’ change in status. However, some bitter Southern whites relied on violence to keep African Americans from participating in politics.
KU KLUX KLAN Founded as a social club for Confederate veterans, the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) started in Tennessee in 1866. As membership in the group spread rapidly through the South, many of the new chapters turned into violent terrorist organizations. By 1868, the Klan existed in practically every Southern state. Its overarching goal was to restore white supremacy. Its method was to prevent African Americans from exercising their political rights. Between 1868 and 1871, the Klan and other secret groups killed thousands of men, women, and children, and burned schools, churches, and property.

Abram Colby, who organized a branch of Georgia’s Equal Rights Association and later served as a Republican member of the Georgia legislature, testified before Congress about Klan atrocities.

A PERSONAL VOICE ABRAM COLBY

“[The Klan] broke my door open, took me out of bed, took me to the woods and whipped me three hours or more and left me for dead. They said to me, ‘Do you think you will ever vote another damned radical ticket?’ . . . I supposed they would kill me anyhow. I said, ‘If there was an election tomorrow, I would vote the radical ticket.’ They set in and whipped me a thousand licks more, with sticks and straps that had buckles on the ends of them.”

—quoted in Testimony Taken by the Joint Select Committee to Inquire into the Condition of Affairs in the Late Insurrectionary States

While the vast majority of the Klan’s victims were African-American, whites who tried to help African Americans—whether by educating them, renting land to them, or buying their crops—were also in danger.

Another Klan objective was to turn the Republicans, who had established the Reconstruction governments, out of power. The North Carolina state senator John Stephens, a white Republican, answered warnings that his life was in danger by saying that some 3,000 African-American voters had supported him “at the risk of persecution and starvation” and that he would not abandon them. Stephens was assassinated in 1870.

While Klan members tried to conceal their identities when they struck, Southern Democrats openly used violence to intimidate Republicans before the 1875 state election in Mississippi. Democrats rioted and attacked Republican leaders and prominent African Americans. Their terrorist campaign frightened the African-American majority away from the polls, and white Democratic candidates swept the election. The Democrats used similar tactics to win the 1876 elections in Florida, South Carolina, and Louisiana.

ECONOMIC PRESSURE The Klan and other secret groups tried to prevent African Americans from making economic, as well as political, progress. African Americans who owned their own land or who worked in occupations other than agriculture were subject to attacks and destruction of property.

In fact, economic necessity forced most former slaves—who had little money or training in other occupations—to work for whites as wage laborers or sharecroppers. Some white Southerners refused to hire or do business with African Americans who were revealed by election officials to have voted Republican. The fear of economic reprisals kept many former slaves from voting at all.
LEGISLATIVE RESPONSE To curtail Klan violence and Democratic intimidation, Congress passed a series of Enforcement Acts in 1870 and 1871. One act provided for the federal supervision of elections in Southern states. Another act gave the president the power to use federal troops in areas where the Klan was active. However, President Grant was not aggressive in his use of the power given to him by the Enforcement Acts, and in 1882, the Supreme Court ruled that the 1871 Enforcement Act was unconstitutional.

Although federal enforcement of anti-Klan legislation was limited, it did contribute to a decrease in the Klan’s activities in the late 1870s. However, the reason for the reduction in Klan violence was the Klan’s own success—by 1880, terrorist groups had managed to restore white supremacy throughout the South. The Klan no longer needed such organized activity to limit the political and civil rights of most African Americans.

SHIFTS IN POLITICAL POWER By passing the Enforcement Acts, Congress seemed to shore up Republican power. But shortly after these acts went into effect, Congress passed legislation that severely weakened the Republican Party in the South. With the Amnesty Act, passed in May 1872, Congress returned the right to vote and the right to hold federal and state offices—revoked by the Fourteenth Amendment—to about 150,000 former Confederates, who would almost certainly vote Democratic. In the same year Congress allowed the Freedmen’s Bureau to expire, believing that it had fulfilled its purpose. As a result of these actions, Southern Democrats had an opportunity to shift the balance of political power in their favor.

Scandals and Money Crises Hurt Republicans

As Southern Republicans struggled to maintain their hold on Reconstruction governments, widespread political corruption in the federal government weakened their party. During the early 1870s, scandals plagued the Grant administration. These scandals diverted public attention away from conditions in the South.

FRAUD AND BRIBERY President Grant was considered an honest man. However, he had had no political experience before becoming president and found it difficult to believe that others might use him for their own political advantage. When making political appointments, he often selected friends and acquaintances rather than people of proven ability. Too frequently, Grant’s appointees turned out to be dishonest.

Beginning in 1872, a series of long-simmering scandals associated with Grant’s administration boiled over. First, a newspaper exposed how the Crédit Mobilier, a construction company working for the Union Pacific Railroad, had skimmed off large profits from the railroad’s government contract. Implicated were several top Republicans, including Vice-President Schuyler Colfax.

REPUBLICAN UNITY SHATTERED A group of Republicans, angered by the corruption, called for honest, efficient government. They formed the Liberal Republican Party in 1872, hoping to oust Grant in that year’s presidential election.
Analyzing Political Cartoons

SCANDAL IN THE GRANT ADMINISTRATION

Political cartoonists had a field day with Grant’s troubles and often criticized the president’s refusal to believe that his associates were dishonest. In this cartoon, President Grant pulls packets labeled with the names of various scandals out of a barrel. The caption—“I hope I get to the bottom soon”—suggests that the corruption in Grant’s administration runs deep and that there may be more scandals to come.

SKILLBUILDER Analyzing Political Cartoons

1. What political scandals can you identify from the packets lying outside the barrel?
2. Why do you think the cartoonist portrayed Grant as having his head stuck in a barrel?


As the 1872 presidential election approached, the Liberal Republicans held a separate convention. They chose Horace Greeley, the editor of the New York Tribune and a vocal pre-Civil War abolitionist, as their candidate. He had supported some Radical Republican causes—abolition and the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. However, he had broken with Radicals by calling for universal amnesty for Confederates and for an end to military rule in the South. Claiming that Reconstruction governments had achieved their purpose, he wanted former slaves to fend for themselves.

Believing that it would take a united effort to oust Grant, the Democrats also nominated Greeley. Nevertheless, Greeley lost the 1872 presidential election to Grant by a wide margin. “I was the worst beaten man that ever ran for that high office,” Greeley said, “and I have been assailed so bitterly that I hardly know whether I was running for President or the penitentiary.” Physically exhausted by his rigorous campaign, Greeley died a few weeks after the election—before the electoral college made his defeat official.

Although the Liberal Republicans did not win the White House, they did weaken the Radicals’ hold over the Republican Party. The breakdown of Republican unity made it even harder for the Radicals to continue to impose their Reconstruction plan on the South.

CONTINUED SCANDAL Despite the rift in the Republican party that resulted from the scandals, corruption in Grant’s administration continued. In 1875, the so-called Whiskey Ring was exposed. Internal-revenue collectors and other officials accepted bribes from whiskey distillers who wanted to avoid paying taxes on their product—a conspiracy that defrauded the federal government of millions of dollars. One of the 238 persons indicted in this scandal was Grant’s private secretary, General Orville E. Babcock. Grant refused to believe that such a close associate was guilty and helped him escape conviction.

Finally, in 1876, an investigation revealed that Secretary of War William W. Belknap had accepted bribes from merchants who wanted to keep their profitable trading concessions in Indian territory. The House of Representatives impeached Belknap, who promptly resigned. The public also learned that the secretary of the navy had taken bribes from shipbuilders and the secretary of the interior had had shady dealings with land speculators. As the evidence mounted, there was increasing disgust with the blatant corruption in the Grant administration, and Grant did not seek reelection in 1876.
Economic Turmoil

As if political scandals were not enough for the country to deal with, a wave of economic troubles hit the nation in 1873.

**THE PANIC OF 1873** The economy had been expanding since the end of the Civil War, and investors became convinced that business profits would continue to increase indefinitely. Eager to take advantage of new business opportunities in the South, Northern and Southern investors borrowed increasing amounts of money and built new facilities as quickly as possible.

Unfortunately, many of those who invested in these new businesses took on more debt than they could afford. A Philadelphia banker named Jay Cooke invested heavily in railroads. Not enough investors bought shares in Cooke's railroad lines to cover his ballooning construction costs, and he could not pay his debts. In September 1873, Cooke's banking firm, the nation's largest dealer in government securities, went bankrupt, setting off a series of financial failures known as the **panic of 1873**. Smaller banks closed, and the stock market temporarily collapsed. Within a year, 89 railroads went broke. By 1875, more than 18,000 companies had folded. The panic triggered a five-year economic depression—a period of reduced business activity and high unemployment—in which 3 million workers lost their jobs.

**CURRENCY DISPUTE** The economic depression following the panic of 1873 also fueled a dispute over currency. This dispute had its roots in the Civil War. During the war, the federal government had begun to issue greenbacks, paper money that was not backed by equal value in gold. When the war ended, many financial experts advocated withdrawing the greenbacks and returning the nation completely to a currency backed by gold. This action would have reduced the number of dollars in circulation.

In contrast, Southern and Western farmers and manufacturers wanted the government to issue even more greenbacks. They believed that “easy money”—a large money supply—would help them pay off their debts.

In 1875, Congress passed the Specie Resumption Act, which promised to put the country back on the gold standard. This act sparked further debate over monetary policies. As the economy improved, beginning in 1878, the controversy died down. However, the passionate debate over the money question in the 1870s was one of many factors that drew the attention of voters and politicians away from Reconstruction.

Judicial and Popular Support Fades

In 1874, a Southern Democratic senator wrote, “Radicalism is dissolving—going to pieces.” Indeed, political scandals, economic problems, and the restoration of political rights to former Confederate Democrats seriously weakened the Radical Republicans. In addition, the Supreme Court began to undo some of the social and political changes that the Radicals had made.
SUPREME COURT DECISIONS  Although Congress had passed important laws to protect the political and civil rights of African Americans, the Supreme Court began to take away those same protections. During the 1870s, the Court issued a series of decisions that undermined both the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.

In the Slaughterhouse cases of 1873, for example, the Court decided that the Fourteenth Amendment protected only the rights people had by virtue of their citizenship in the United States, such as the right of interstate travel and the right to federal protection when traveling on the high seas and abroad. The Court contended that most of Americans’ basic civil rights were obtained through their citizenship in a state and that the amendment did not protect those rights.

Another setback for Reconstruction was U.S. v. Cruikshank in 1876, in which the Court ruled that the Fourteenth Amendment did not give the federal government the right to punish individual whites who oppressed blacks. The same year, in U.S. v. Reese, the Court ruled in favor of officials who had barred African Americans from voting, stating that the Fifteenth Amendment did not “confer the right of suffrage on anyone” but merely listed grounds on which states could not deny suffrage. By the late 1870s, the Supreme Court’s restrictive rulings had narrowed the scope of these amendments so much that the federal government no longer had much power to protect the rights of African Americans. Although the Supreme Court would later overturn them, these decisions impeded African Americans’ efforts to gain equality for years to come.

NORTHERN SUPPORT FADES  As the Supreme Court rejected Reconstruction policies in the 1870s, Northern voters grew indifferent to events in the South. Weary of the “Negro question” and sick of “carpetbag government,” many Northern voters shifted their attention to such national concerns as the panic of 1873 and the corruption in Grant’s administration. In addition, a desire for reconciliation between the regions spread through the North. Although political violence continued in the South and African Americans were denied civil and political rights, the tide of public opinion in the North began to turn against Reconstruction policies.

As both judicial and public support decreased, Republicans began to back away from their commitment to Reconstruction. The impassioned Radicals who had led the fight for congressional Reconstruction, Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens, were dead. Business interests diverted the attention of both moderates and Radicals, and scalawags and carpetbaggers deserted the Republican Party. Moreover, Republicans gradually came to believe that government could not impose the moral and social changes needed for former slaves to make progress in the South. As a result, Republicans slowly retreated from the policies of Reconstruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Decision(s)</th>
<th>Ruling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Slaughterhouse cases</td>
<td>Most civil rights were ruled to be state, rather than federal, rights and therefore unprotected by the Fourteenth Amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>U.S. v. Cruikshank</td>
<td>The Fourteenth Amendment was ruled not to grant the federal government power to punish whites who oppressed blacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>U.S. v. Reese</td>
<td>The Fifteenth Amendment was determined not to grant voting rights to anyone, but rather to restrict types of voter discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Democrats “Redeem” the South

Between 1869 and 1875, Democrats recaptured the state governments of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. As a result of redemption—as the Democrats called their return to power in the South—and the national election of 1876, congressional Reconstruction came to an end.

ELECTION OF 1876

In 1876, Grant decided not to run for a third term. The Republicans then chose the stodgy governor of Ohio, Rutherford B. Hayes, as their candidate. Smelling victory, the Democrats put up one of their ablest leaders, Governor Samuel J. Tilden of New York. Tilden had helped clean up the graft that had flourished in New York City under the corrupt Tweed Ring.

As most people had expected, Tilden won the popular vote. However, he fell one short of the number of electoral votes needed to win, and 20 electoral votes were disputed. Congress appointed a commission to deal with the problem. The commission, which had a Republican majority, gave the election to the Republican, Hayes, even though he had received a minority of the popular vote.

For the first time in U.S. history, a candidate who had lost the popular election became president. How did it happen? In the oldest tradition of politics, party leaders made a deal. Although Republicans controlled the electoral commission, Democrats controlled the House of Representatives, which had to approve the election results. Southern Democrats were willing to accept Hayes if they could get something in return.

The price they demanded was, first of all, the withdrawal of federal troops from Louisiana and South Carolina—two of the three Southern states that Republicans still governed. Second, the Democrats wanted federal money to build a railroad from Texas to the West Coast and to improve Southern rivers, harbors, and bridges. Third, they wanted Hayes to appoint a conservative Southerner to the cabinet. In the Compromise of 1877, Republican leaders agreed to these demands, and Hayes was peacefully inaugurated. The acceptance of this compromise meant the end of Reconstruction in the South.

HOME RULE IN THE SOUTH

After the 1876 election, Republicans and Democrats disputed the results in Louisiana’s and South Carolina’s elections, and both states ended up with two rival state governments! When Hayes later removed the federal troops in those states, the Democrats took over. Florida also had questionable election returns, but the state supreme court ruled in favor of the Democrats. As a result, Republicans no longer controlled the government of any Southern state.

The Democrats had achieved their long-desired goal of home rule—the ability to run state governments without federal intervention. These so-called Redeemers set out to rescue the South from what they viewed as a decade of mismanagement by Northerners, Republicans, and African Americans. They passed laws that restricted the rights of African Americans, wiped out social programs, slashed taxes, and dismantled public schools.

Analyzing Causes

How did the Compromise of 1877 bring about the end of Reconstruction?
LEGACY OF RECONSTRUCTION  Despite the efforts of African Americans and many Radical Republicans, Reconstruction ended without much real progress in the battle against discrimination. Charles Harris, an African-American Union Army veteran and former Alabama legislator, expressed his frustration in an 1877 letter.

A PERSONAL VOICE  CHARLES HARRIS

"We obey laws; others make them. We support state educational institutions, whose doors are virtually closed against us. We support asylums and hospitals, and our sick, deaf, dumb, or blind are met at the doors by . . . unjust discriminations. . . . From these and many other oppressions . . . our people long to be free."
—quoted in American Colonization Society Papers in the Congressional Record

Although Radical Republicans wanted to help the former slaves, they made several serious mistakes. First, they assumed that extending certain civil rights to freed persons would enable them to protect themselves through participation in government, especially in lawmaking. However, Congress did not adequately protect those rights, and the Supreme Court undermined them. Second, the Radicals balked at distributing land to former slaves, which prevented them from becoming

POINT

“Reconstruction was a failure.”
Federal and state governments failed to secure the rights guaranteed to former slaves by constitutional amendments.
- State Republican parties could not preserve black-white voter coalitions that would have enabled them to stay in power and continue political reform.
- Radical Republican governments were unable or unwilling to enact land reform or to provide former slaves with the economic resources needed to break the cycle of poverty.
- Racial bias was a national, not a regional, problem. After the Panic of 1873, Northerners were more concerned with economic problems than with the problems of former slaves.
- The Supreme Court undermined the power of the former slaves.

At the end of Reconstruction, former slaves found themselves once again in a subordinate position in society. The historian Eric Foner concludes, "Whether measured by the dreams inspired by emancipation or the more limited goals of securing blacks’ rights as citizens . . . , Reconstruction can only be judged a failure.

COUNTERPOINT

“Reconstruction was a success.”
Reconstruction was an attempt to create a social and political revolution despite economic collapse and the opposition of much of the white South. Under these conditions its accomplishments were extraordinary.
- African Americans only a few years removed from slavery participated at all levels of government.
- State governments had some success in solving social problems; for example, they funded public school systems open to all citizens.
- African Americans established institutions that had been denied them during slavery: schools, churches, and families.
- The breakup of the plantation system led to some redistribution of land.
- Congress passed the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, which helped African Americans to attain full civil rights in the 20th century.

W. E. B. Du Bois summarized the achievements of the period this way: “[I]t was Negro loyalty and the Negro vote alone that restored the South to the Union; established the new democracy, both for white and black.”

Despite the loss of ground that followed Reconstruction, African Americans succeeded in carving out a measure of independence within Southern society.

THINKING CRITICALLY

1. CONNECT TO HISTORY  Evaluating What are the two major arguments each side makes as to whether Reconstruction was a success or failure? Which perspective do you agree with, and why?

2. CONNECT TO TODAY  Analyzing Issues One historian has referred to Reconstruction as “America’s Unfinished Revolution.” Is the U.S. still dealing with issues left over from that period? Research Reconstruction’s legacy using newspapers, magazines, or other sources. Make a short persuasive presentation in class.
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economically independent of the landowning planter class. Finally, the Radicals did not fully realize the extent to which deep-seated racism in society would weaken the changes that Congress had tried to make.

But congressional Reconstruction was not a complete failure. The Thirteenth Amendment permanently abolished slavery in all of the states. Furthermore, Radical Republicans did succeed in passing the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, and although the Supreme Court narrowed the interpretation of the amendments during the 1870s, they remained part of the Constitution. In the 20th century, the amendments provided the necessary constitutional foundation for important civil rights legislation.

During Reconstruction, African Americans had founded many black colleges and volunteer organizations, and the percentage of literate African Americans had gradually increased. The memory of this time of expanding opportunities lived on in the African-American community and inspired the fight to regain civil rights.
TERMS & NAMES
For each term or name below, write a sentence explaining its connection to Reconstruction.

1. Andrew Johnson  
2. Radical Republicans  
3. Freedmen’s Bureau  
4. Fourteenth Amendment  
5. Fifteenth Amendment  
6. carpetbagger  
7. Hiram Revels  
8. sharecropping  
9. Ku Klux Klan (KKK)  
10. Rutherford B. Hayes

MAIN IDEAS
Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

The Politics of Reconstruction (pages 376–382)
1. How did Andrew Johnson’s plan to reconstruct the Confederate states differ from Lincoln’s?
2. How did the Civil Rights Act of 1866 become law?
3. Why did the Radicals want to impeach Andrew Johnson?

Reconstructing Society (pages 383–392)
4. What three groups made up the Republican Party in the South during Reconstruction?
5. In what ways did emancipated slaves exercise their freedom?
6. How did white landowners in the South reassert their economic power in the decade following the Civil War?

The Collapse of Reconstruction (pages 393–401)
7. How did Southern whites regain political power during Reconstruction?
8. What economic and political developments weakened the Republican Party during Grant’s second term?
9. What significance did the victory by Rutherford B. Hayes in the 1876 presidential race have for Reconstruction?

CRITICAL THINKING
1. USING YOUR NOTES In a chart like the one below, list the results of the national elections of 1866, 1868, 1870, 1872, and 1876. Then note how each result affected Reconstruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. ANALYZING ISSUES How do you think Reconstruction could have been made more effective in rebuilding the South and ensuring the rights of the freed slaves?

3. EVALUATING Do you think the changes in the South during Reconstruction benefited Southerners? Support your opinion.

4. DEVELOPING HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE What might Americans today learn from the civil rights experiences of African Americans during Reconstruction?
Use the quotation below and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer question 1.

“On the coast of South Carolina, after a year of experimenting on the willingness of the freedmen to work and their ability to support themselves, a plan was begun of cutting up the large estates into twenty and forty acre plots, to be sold to the freedmen at government prices. . . . This plan was eminently fair and just; it was also a radical abolition of slavery. It made the freedman owner of his own labor, and also an owner of a fair share of the land. . . . At the first sale of these lands, the freedmen came up promptly and bought largely, showing the thrift and shrewdness of men worthy of citizenship.”

—James McCune Smith, quoted in Witness for Freedom: African American Voices on Race, Slavery, and Emancipation

1. According to the point of view expressed in the quotation, the best way to help former slaves was to —
   A. encourage plantation owners to hire former slaves.
   B. allow plantation owners to buy back their land.
   C. assist former slaves in gaining ownership of land.
   D. divide large plantations into smaller plots.

2. In the Reconstruction Act of 1867, Congress set requirements for the readmission of former Confederate states into the Union. Which of the following problems did the act address?
   F. Southern states did not allow African Americans to vote.
   G. Southern states had little money to pay for public works projects.
   H. Former slaves needed education.
   J. Confederate bonds and money were worthless.

3. Which of the following items was responsible for finally ending Reconstruction in the South?
   A. ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment
   B. the Compromise of 1877
   C. President Grant’s failure to win reelection
   D. the decisions of the Supreme Court in the 1870s

For additional test practice, go online for:
- Diagnostic tests
- Tutorials

INTERACT WITH HISTORY
Recall the issues that you explored at the beginning of the chapter. Now that you have read more about efforts to reconstruct the South, what is your opinion of how the government handled Reconstruction? Write an opinion statement. Consider the following questions:
   • What goals did the government actually set for Reconstruction?
   • How could the government have pursued its goals more effectively?
   • What additional goals should the government have set? Why?

FOCUS ON WRITING
During Reconstruction, many leaders felt that it was the president’s responsibility to restore the Union. Others felt it was the responsibility of Congress. Write a persuasive essay expressing your view on who should oversee Reconstruction in the former Confederacy. Be sure to include evidence that supports your position while also highlighting the negative aspects of the alternative plan for Reconstruction.

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING
In a small group read and discuss the “One American’s Story” at the beginning of Section 2. Then create a presentation that Robert Fitzgerald might have used to convince Northerners to support the Freedmen’s Bureau and schools for former slaves. What if Fitzgerald had had access to 21st-century technology? Use audio, video, or computer software to make the presentation more effective. Present the final product to your class.