THE CIVIL WAR
The Counter revolution of 1861 And The Cause Of The Conflict

By: Sydney Mayhew
Lincoln’s election

- He was elected 16th president.
- He was the first Republican to win presidency and he received only 40% of the popular vote.
- When he ran in the senatorial campaign (1858) many public encounters of the slavery issue were brought up.
- Stephen Douglas believed each territory should decide whether they would abolish slavery or continue with it.
Lincoln argued against slavery.

These were known as the Lincoln-Douglas debates.

Lincoln lost the Senate race however, great attention was brought to the Republican party.

Lincoln’s election to the presidency threatened the South

- Southern States began to leave the Union due to the issue of slavery

- Southern States didn’t want Lincoln to win the elections, because he was Republican and Republicans opposed slavery

- Lincoln told southerners: "You think slavery is right and should be extended, while we think it is wrong and should be limited. That, I suppose, is the trouble. It surely is the only important difference between us."

- The idea of leaving the Union began to split Northern and Southern states

- The North believed that splitting would start a civil war
-His election threatened to abolish slavery

-South Carolina believed that slavery would eventually be abolished under the Republican’s ways

-After the secession of South Carolina, Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Texas followed in becoming the Confederate States

-Lincoln attempted to bring Confederacy back into the Union by saying that slavery would still exist where it currently existed

Arguments for Southern Secession

- Many insist that the war was caused, because the Southern States wanted to preserve slavery.

- 11 southern States declared secession from the U.S.

- Those in favor of secession argued that the Federal Government was a Union of states.

- They believed that in the Union their rights would be respected.
The South wasn’t satisfied with the military
They wanted to keep their culture
Before the North changed any laws they wanted to take charge
The South was an agricultural based society (Fear of economic depression if slavery were to end, relied on slave labor)
- They believed that becoming sovereign would boost economy and decrease expenses
- They were unhappy with the “One-sided” government view
- They believed the North states were favored
-When the Union interfered with slavery they thought they had lost their rights

-Their other belief was that the Declaration of Independence gave people the right to change or alter their government when it no longer protected their rights

-On 20, 1860 South Carolina passed the first Ordinance of Secession

Who was John Brown?

- John Brown was an individual who believed in brutal overthrow of the slavery system.
- Brown and his sons often led attacks on pro-slavery citizens.
- He used the excuse that his actions were, because of the will of God.
- Brown became a hero in the eyes of Northern extremists.
- By 1858 he created a small “army” of individuals who were on a mission to rebel among slaves.
Their initial goal was to gather supplies and use them to arm a slave rebellion.

He was captured during the raid and eventually hung.

He became an anti-slavery icon.

Video
What was the impact of John Brown’s raid on Harper’s Ferry?

- On October 16, 1859, John Brown led 18 men into the town of Harper’s Ferry, Virginia.

- His plan was to steal arms and ammunition in the federal arsenal and arm slaves in the area.

- They planned on moving south which would lead to attracting slaves to the cause.
-He moved along the Appalachian Mountains

-It continued to divide the North and the South all over the issue of slavery

Lincoln’s and Davis’ view of Fort Sumpter in 1861
On December 26, 1860 Robert Anderson took Fort Sumter

They were short on supplies and Lincoln wanted to send supplies without bloodshed

Lincoln informed Confederates of his plan of “Food for the hungry”

The Confederates attacked and Fort Sumter Surrendered
- Symbol of secession

- The North gained control of Fort Moultrie and wanted Sumter
Lincoln’s view

- Many Southern leaders of the Civil War blamed Lincoln provoked the war

- They believe his intention was to overthrow the Confederacy by advancing towards the South which led to the war

- Lincoln didn’t send reinforcements however he did send food

- He called it as a “humanitarian mission” or “food for hungry men”
Davis’ view

-If Davis were to attack Lincoln’s resupply mission it would make the South look as if they were the ones instigating the war

-He couldn’t let the Fort be resupplied

-Davis came to the conclusion that he had no choice but to order Anderson to surrender

-Anderson refused
The president chose a Virginian to lead Union forces
Why is it important for Lincoln to keep the border states in the Union

- Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri had a white population of almost 2,600,000

- Nearly half of the population of the eleven states of the Confederacy

- Maryland bordered the District of Columbia on three sides

- Washington’s telegraph and rail links to the north and west of this territory
Kentucky was bordered by the Ohio River and the Mississippi River, it was between the Old Northwest and Confederate Tennessee.

- It was the key defense for the states of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.

- Kentucky controlled access to multiple river systems such as the Tennessee and the Cumberland.

- Missouri was a great agricultural state in grain and livestock.
- The border states had access to multiple water sources and great agriculture.

- They were a huge part of the white population, had good military defense and communication networks and Lincoln knew he couldn’t lose them, because it would hurt our country.
Border states didn’t declare secession

- Delaware
- Kentucky
- Maryland
- Missouri
Border States Declared Secession After Fort Sumter

- Arkansas
- North Carolina
- Tennessee
- Virginia

“Lincoln gave his now iconic "House Divided" speech upon receiving the Illinois Republican Party's nomination for a seat in the United States Senate in 1858. In the race that ensued, Lincoln would face off against Democrat Stephen Douglas in a series of highly publicized debates about national issues, most importantly the institution of slavery. Lincoln eventually lost the election to Douglas, but the debates and media coverage of them vaulted the previously unknown lawyer to national stardom and, eventually, the Presidency in 1860.”

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:
“House Divided” Speech

- “I believe this government cannot endure permanently, half slave and half free”

- This speech did not try to end slavery
Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:

If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. "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 and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, 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.

Have we no tendency to the latter condition?
Let anyone who doubts carefully contemplate that now almost complete legal combination -- piece of machinery, so to speak -- compounded of the Nebraska doctrine and the Dred Scott decision. Let him consider, not only what work the machinery is adapted to do, and how well adapted, but also let him study the history of its construction and trace, if he can, or rather fail, if he can, to trace the evidences of design and concert of action among its chief architects, from the beginning.

The new year of 1854 found slavery excluded from more than half the states by state constitutions and from most of the national territory by congressional prohibition. Four days later commenced the struggle which ended in repealing that congressional prohibition. This opened all the national territory to slavery and was the first point gained.

But, so far, Congress only had acted; and an endorsement by the people, real or apparent, was indispensable to save the point already gained and give chance for more.

This necessity had not been overlooked, but had been provided for, as well as might be, in the notable argument of "squatter sovereignty," other-wise called "sacred right of self-government," which latter phrase, though expressive of the only rightful basis of any government, was so perverted in this attempted use of it as to amount to just this: That if any one man choose to enslave another, no third man shall be allowed to object. That argument was incorporated into the Nebraska Bill itself, in the language which follows:
It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into an territory or state, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people there-of perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.

Then opened the roar of loose declamation in favor of "squatter sovereignty" and "sacred right of self-government." "But," said opposition members, "let us amend the bill so as to expressly declare that the people of the territory may exclude slavery." "Not we," said the friends of the measure; and down they voted the amendment.

While the Nebraska Bill was passing through Congress, a law case, involving the question of a Negro's freedom, by reason of his owner having voluntarily taken him first into a free state and then into a territory covered by the congressional prohibition, and held him as a slave for a long time in each, was passing through the United States Circuit Court for the district of Missouri; and both Nebraska Bill and lawsuit were brought to a decision in the same month of May 1854. The Negro's name was Dred Scott, which name now designates the decision finally made in the case. Before the then next presidential election, the law case came to, and was argued in, the Supreme Court of the United States; but the decision of it was deferred until after the election. Still, before the election, Senator Trumbull, on the floor of the Senate, requested the leading advocate of the Nebraska Bill to state his opinion whether the people of a territory can constitutionally exclude slavery from their limits; and the latter answers: "That is a question for the Supreme Court."
The election came. Mr. Buchanan was elected, and the endorsement, such as it was, secured. That was the second point gained. The endorsement, however, fell short of a clear popular majority by nearly 400,000 votes, and so, perhaps, was not overwhelmingly reliable and satisfactory. The outgoing President, in his last annual message, as impressively as possible echoed back upon the people the weight and authority of the endorsement. The Supreme Court met again, did not announce their decision, but ordered a reargument.

The presidential inauguration came, and still no decision of the Court; but the incoming President, in his inaugural address, fervently exhorted the people to abide by the forthcoming decision, whatever it might be. Then, in a few days, came the decision.

The reputed author of the Nebraska Bill finds an early occasion to make a speech at this capital endorsing the Dred Scott decision, and vehemently denouncing all opposition to it. The new President, too, seizes the early occasion of the Silliman letter to endorse and strongly construe that decision, and to express his astonishment that any different view had ever been entertained!
At length a squabble springs up between the President and the author of the Nebraska Bill, on the mere question of fact, whether the Lecompton constitution was or was not in any just sense made by the people of Kansas; and in that quarrel the latter declares that all he wants is a fair vote for the people, and that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up. I do not understand his declaration, that he cares not whether slavery be voted down or voted up, to be intended by him other than as an apt definition of the policy he would impress upon the public mind -- the principle for which he declares he has suffered so much and is ready to suffer to the end. And well may he cling to that principle! If he has any parental feeling, well may he cling to it. That principle is the only shred left of his original Nebraska doctrine.

Under the Dred Scott decision, "squatter sovereignty" squatted out of existence, tumbled down like temporary scaffolding; like the mold at the foundry, served through one blast and fell back into loose sand; helped to carry an election and then was kicked to the winds. His late joint struggle with the Republicans against the Lecompton constitution involves nothing of the original Nebraska doctrine. That struggle was made on a point -- the right of a people to make their own constitution -- upon which he and the Republicans have never differed.

The several points of the Dred Scott decision, in connection with Senator Douglas' "care not" policy, constitute the piece of machinery in its present state of advancement. This was the third point gained. The working points of that machinery are:
First, that no Negro slave, imported as such from Africa, and no descendant of such slave can ever be a citizen of any state in the sense of that term as used in the Constitution of the United States. This point is made in order to deprive the Negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of that provision of the United States Constitution which declares that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states."

Second, that, "subject to the Constitution of the United States," neither Congress nor a territorial legislature can exclude slavery from any United States territory. This point is made in order that individual men may fill up the territories with slaves, without danger of losing them as property, and thus enhance the chances of permanency to the institution through all the future.

Third, that whether the holding a Negro in actual slavery in a free state makes him free, as against the holder, the United States courts will not decide, but will leave to be decided by the courts of any slave state the Negro may be forced into by the master. This point is made, not to be pressed immediately but, if acquiesced in for awhile, and apparently endorsed by the people at an election, then to sustain the logical conclusion that what Dred Scott’s master might lawfully do with Dred Scott in the free state of Illinois, every other master may lawfully do with any other one, or 1,000 slaves, in Illinois or in any other free state.
Auxiliary to all this, and working hand in hand with it, the Nebraska doctrine, or what is left of it, is to educate and mold public opinion, at least Northern public opinion, not to care whether slavery is voted down or voted up. This shows exactly where we now are; and partially, also, whither we are tending.

It will throw additional light on the latter to go back and run the mind over the string of historical facts already stated. Several things will now appear less dark and mysterious than they did when they were transpiring. The people were to be left "perfectly free," "subject only to the Constitution." What the Constitution had to do with it, outsiders could not then see. Plainly enough, now, it was an exactly fitted niche for the Dred Scott decision to afterward come in and declare the perfect freedom of the people to be just no freedom at all.

Why was the amendment expressly declaring the right of the people voted down? Plainly enough, now, the adoption of it would have spoiled the niche for the Dred Scott decision. Why was the Court decision held up? Why even a senator's individual opinion withheld till after the presidential election? Plainly enough, now, the speaking out then would have damaged the "perfectly free" argument upon which the election was to be carried. Why the outgoing President's felicitation on the endorsement? Why the delay of a reargument? Why the incoming President's advance exhortation in favor of the decision? These things look like the cautious patting and petting of a spirited horse preparatory to mounting him when it is dreaded that he may give the rider a fall. And why the hasty after-endorsement of the decision by the President and others?
We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen -- Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance -- and when we see these timbers joined together and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few, not omitting even scaffolding, or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such piece in -- in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.
a.) Abraham Lincoln: was running for a seat in the United States Senate in 1858.

-Lincoln would run against Democrat Stephen Douglas in multiple debates about national issues and the main topic of slavery

-Lincoln eventually lost the election to Douglas

-Lincoln ended up winning Presidency 1860
b.) It is an authentic source

c.) It was about how Lincoln believed that the United States of America should not be divided for the issue of slavery. He believed we all need to come together as a nation and conquer issues as one. Slavery should not hold us back and we should move on and abolish slavery and look at our bright future.

d.) The speech was given on June 16, 1858
The purpose of Lincoln’s speech was to help Lincoln’s politician campaign and to raise awareness for abolishing slavery. He wanted to make the nation realize the importance of coming together and becoming stronger than before. The South and North should no longer be divided due to the issue of slavery or anything for that manner.

“A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure, permanently, half slave and half free.”
Our nation cannot afford to be split into two sides due to one issue of slavery.
Value and Limitation

-The source was produced to state Lincoln’s opinions and ideas for how our country could come together as a whole. It also gave people the controversial idea of slavery and they compared their opinion to Lincoln’s.

-”Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction…”

-The information is reliable, because it is Lincoln’s exact words from his speech.
Abraham Lincoln put forward his opinion on slavery and how slavery holds us back from future expansion and progress. Current ideas of this time were divided by the North and the South’s opinions on whether slavery should continue or be abolished.

“This point is made in order to deprive the Negro, in every possible event, of the benefit of that provision of the United States Constitution which declares that "the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states."