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To seek the origins of the Civil War is to range over much of the nation's early history."

"Either the American people plunged into civil war for light and transient reasons, or else the spectacular quarrel over slavery in the territories was merely the skirmish line of a larger and more fundamental conflict." ((Don E. Fehrenbacher, "Disunion and Reunion," in John M. Higham, ed., *Reconstruction of American History* [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962], 98-118 quotes on 100, 101-102.)

“The definition of a *confederate republic* seems simply to be ‘an assemblage of societies,’ or an association of two or more states into one state . . . . The proposed Constitution, as far from implying an abolition of the State governments, makes them constituent parts of the national sovereignty, by allowing them a direct representation in the Senate, and leaves in their possession certain exclusive and very important portions of the sovereign power. This fully corresponds, in every rational import of the terms, with the idea of a federal government.”

(Alexander Hamilton, “The Federalist No. 9,” in Robert Scigliano, ed., *The Federalist: A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States . . . [New York: The Modern Library, 2001], 47-*52, quote.)

“And in the event of a failure of every constitutional resort, and an accumulation of usurpations & abuses, rendering passive obedience & non-resistance a greater evil, than resistence [sic] & revolution, there can remain but one resort, the last of all, an appeal from the cancelled obligations of the constitutional compact, to original rights & the law of self-preservation. This is the ultima ratio under all Govt. whether consolidated, confederated, or a compound of both; and it cannot be doubted that a single member of the Union, in the extremity supposed, but in that only would have a right, as an extra & ultra constitutional right, to make the appeal.”

(James Madison to Edward Everett, August 28, 1830 in Jack N. Rakove, ed., *Madison: Writings* [New York: Library of America, 1999], 842-852 quote on 848.)

With the bicentennial of Abraham Lincoln’s birth in 1809 now behind us and the sesquicentennial of America’s Civil War of 1861-1865 coming to an end in 2015, can anything new possibly be said about the conflict and its causes and consequences? For starters, how about its Northern rather then Southern origins to be found in Romantic-perfectionist-nationalist philosophy beyond slavery? (To quote David A. Goldfield, “America’s Romantic age had produced a Civil War.”) How about more than slavery being involved as the sole and single cause not only with respect to the South as the central theme of its history (to maintain the region as a “White Man’s” land), but also related to the North and the opposition to slavery being about more than a defense of black equality (on the part both of Lincoln and the Republican party and many abolitionists before them)? What about the Civil War being avoidable and “needless” as well, by no means popular views, as recently argued by Jeffrey Hummel, David Goldfield, and Michael C. C. Adams (*Emancipating Slaves, Enslaving Free Men, America Aflame*, and *Living Hell: The Dark Side of the Civil War*)? What about the “Lost Cause” of the South being less mythical and more accurate about American history between 1776 and 1861 concerning (1) the Declaration to be more about independence and a justification for secession from the British Empire than equal rights for all men; (2) the federal rather than national nature of the government and union of 1787-1788 (the Constitution as amended); and (3) states’ rights as an original intention rather than a later and perverse one newly invented solely for the defense of slavery within the union? Then, there is the historical revisionism on the part of Lincoln and the Republicans (and others in the North) to reinterpret the Revolution and Constitution to deny the less than egalitarian, democratic, nationalist, and abolitionist intentions of the founders and framers and to invent the myth of a “Slave Power” in order to make the South (and their Northern allies) about the defense of slavery alone rather than original intentions.1

Why a new Republican party at all after the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 when slavery based on large-scale plantation agriculture was not about to expand “nationally” and the newer territories were destined to become “free soil” (as David Goldfield has recently reaffirmed an old truth)? Why, too, their demand for a total prohibition of slavery from the territories by Congressional or *national action* unilaterally that they knew was a violation of the federal compact of 1787-1788 as amended and that left to the states (through power reserved to them by the Tenth Amendment) sole authority alone to decide for or against slavery? After all, America as a federal republic and a union of the states had resolved the problem of slavery in the new republic not by redefining liberty or the Constitution, but by taking positive steps consistent with eighteenth-century republicanism to assure its gradual abolition (abolishing the slave trade, expatriation back to Africa by colonization, private manumission, and dispersal into the territories). Even if the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 repealed the sacrosanct Missouri compromise line of 36  30’, all Lincoln and the Republicans had to do was to agree to extend it to the Pacific Ocean. This they refused to do. 2

Why they did so needs to be reexamined in order to understand the Northern rather than Southern origins of America’s civil war that was always about more than slavery. What else happened outside the South to make war inevitable in the end and truly a “clash of civilizations”? "The war is not a civil war; it is a war of two countries divided by geographical lines and interests . . . ." So John M. Daniel described it at the beginning. In *The Life and Death of Democracy*, John Keane gets more specific about North-South differences. “[T]he Civil War was the first recorded war between two aspiring representative democracies, whose political elites were prone to think of themselves as defenders of two incompatible definitions of democracy” understood to be American representative republicanism of the eighteenth-century versus majoritarian democracy of the nineteenth-century as he himself does. In this sense, “The conflict in a way was a clash between two historical eras.”3

The issue that finally led to war, slavery in the territories, was a constitutional one involving the nature of the union and its federal versus national character. For their part, the demand by Lincoln and the Republicans for non-extensionism by a total prohibition by Congress signaled to the South the end of the American republic as a federal polity. States alone, and only after being duly admitted into the union, had the sovereign authority to approve or abolish slavery. Since slavery was not about to expand westward because of well-known “Natural Limits” to staple crop agriculture, for the South (and other Northerners) the issue of slavery in the territories was very much a matter of principle and constitutional scruple. What is more, the Lincoln-Republican reinterpretation of the American founding (including the Declaration of Independence as well as the Constitution nationalized and the Union made absolute) *belied* their repeated assurances that slavery where it existed was not threatened (more about this later). 4

 For the South, the Lincoln-Republican rejection of original intentions constitutionally was *casus belli* enough to begin to withdraw from the Union based on the right of revolution proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence (not of equality) of 1776. For that matter, Lincoln and the Republicans even rejected the “popular sovereignty” theory of Stephen A. Douglas despite its guarantee of “free soil” results with respect to migration and settlement by Northerners with anti-slavery views. (As a matter of principle, the South equally opposed “popular sovereignty” because it gave to mere territorial governments the final authority to decide for or against slavery before official statehood was achieved. John C. Calhoun had said the same thing in 1837 regarding the admission of Michigan thus demonstrating the consistency of Southern constitutional objections.)5

 If the South was defending original intentions originally both with respect to the principles of 1776 and 1787, Lincoln and the Republicans were not. Besides denying the federal nature of the union and the rights of states concerning slavery, Lincoln and the Republicans also repudiated the right of revolution asserted in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence as justification for the colonies’ withdrawal from an empire grown absolute and arbitrary that Great Britain had become between 1688 and 1776. The nearly equal time frame of eighty-eight years between the former events and the eighty-four years between 1776 and 1860 is highly suggestive of similar and parallel transformational developments, political and constitutional, between Great Britain and America that deserve further exploration and emphasis. William J. Cooper, Jr., preeminent scholar of Southern history, had this to say about the South on the eve of secession. “As Southerners viewed the political world after November 1860, their liberty had never been so insecure . . . . Southerners placed themselves squarely in the tradition of the revolutionary struggle for liberty. They saw themselves emulating the heroic stance their grandfathers had taken in 1775 and 1776. In this vision the new oppressor, the reconstituted perfidious England, was the new central Union created from the subversion of the Constitution by those who wanted to master the South. And, of course, to master meant to shackle liberty.” (On “the right to rebel,” John Phillip Reid writes that “From the oldest constitution, the ancient constitution, for example, the Virginia Constitution kept the right to rebel” and “the New Jersey Constitution retained the right of the people to declare the original contract dissolved for cause.” Government by consent and agreement also meant a right to begin government anew.)6

 In the South, soon to be a new CSA, the linkage between ’76 and ’61 was more than rhetorical posturing. By copious reiteration in speech and print, before 1860 and after 1865, the Revolution, the Constitution, and the principles of republicanism and federalism as original intentions were deemed essential to the preservation of liberty by limiting the scope of central or national authority. History had purpose and meaning and the lessons of the past taught the inevitable rise and fall of republics from corruption within that led to tyranny and usurpation. These same ideas persisted after 1865 and the abolition of slavery thus eliminating the “peculiar institution” as the sole reason for states’ rights thinking anew after 1787. Final defeat militarily did not mean the cause of the South and the CSA (in defense of the republic) were lost. Indeed, the revival of the Democratic (republican) party nationally after 1865 suggests that more than slavery and race were involved again.7

 Well before the more famous invocation by Lincoln of “four score and seven years ago” in his Gettysburg Address, following the official Emancipation Proclamation of January 1, 1863, America’s sixteenth president and his Republican party had already commenced war against the South by proclaiming hostility to slavery and the need for a rebirth of freedom nationally. Denial of equal access to the territories, even as a temporary matter related to commerce or internal travel otherwise, was viewed not only as an unjust stigma marking the Southern people as unequal citizens politically and morally (by different criteria not Biblical or Constitutional), but it forced them to calculate the value of the Union. This the South did again between 1850 and 1860 with the clear understanding that should a Northern antislavery and purely sectional party capture control of the federal government in a presidential election, secession would be the result justifiably and, hopefully, peacefully. When the unthinkable happened in the election of 1860, with the triumph of Lincoln and the new Republican party, Southern states began withdrawing from the Union. By March 4, 1861, seven Southern states had seceded and begun government anew with the formation of a provisional Confederate States of America.8

 Having succeeded in provoking Southern secessionism, Lincoln and the Republican party next maneuvered the Confederates into firing the first shots of the civil war. Real war against the South began on April 15, 1861 with the call for 75,000 volunteers to suppress the “rebellion” down South following the Confederate bombardment of Ft. Sumter on April 12. Far from preserving the Union of old, that Lincoln said had to cease being half-slave and half-free, he and the Republicans were very much about making it *anew* into the states united instead of the union of the states it had been since 1776! Before emancipation in 1863 and the final abolition of slavery in 1865, there first had to be a new *Nation* and this process of unification began with removing finally the threat of Southern disunionism by military conquest. Toward this higher end was the destruction of slavery always more of a military necessity than a humanitarian gesture. (As Brian R. Dirck states unequivocally, “Lincoln’s new party, like Lincoln himself, was antislavery, but not especially committed to the pursuit of racial equality.”)9

 For all of the modern studies of America’s Civil War of 1861-1865, that conflict’s most important consequence has yet to be discerned. While historians agree that the war resulted in a new American nation with a new constitution (by amendments 13, 14, and 15), they have not fully appreciated the fact that it also gave us a new national history or mythology, which was essential to justifying a Northern war of aggression against the South. Today, however, the myths of democracy (America was democratic, egalitarian, abolitionist, and nationalist at its birth between 1776 and 1787) and a reactionary South (caused by slavery that made the land of Dixie turn its back on the ideas and ideals of the founders and instead invent a new states’ rights philosophy of government along with a proslavery ideology as the means to preserve its “peculiar institution” and maintain the South as a “white man’s” land) still inform historical writing about the war’s causes and consequences. In sum, the North was right historically and constitutionally and the South was wrong. Slavery was the sole cause of the conflict and the central theme of Southern history as well.10

Thus, we come to a most perplexing question. If the South was right all along about the legitimacy of secession and in its historical interpretation of early American history, and if it was the North that changed (as James M. McPherson asserts in *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* [New York, 1988], 860-861), why do Americans and most scholars believe otherwise? Suffice it to say for now that American and Southern history were rewritten by Northerners to give us the consensus view that still predominates today. Put another way, not the *republican* South as the defender of original intentions, but the *imagined one of aristocracy and slavery* (notwithstanding the fact that most antebellum white Southerners were non-slaveholders and enjoyed representative government) had to be excised from the body politic and remade in the image of the North that Lincoln and the Republican party were creating anew based upon a reinterpretation of the principles of 1776 and 1787. By making the founders more democratic, egalitarian, nationalistic, and anti-slavery than they really were at the beginning of the American republic, the creation of a new history for a new nation was a critical part of the Northern path to war against the South because it justified the denial of secession and the creation of the states united as the first steps toward the reconstruction of America itself (conquest of the West, we forget, began in 1862 with war against the Amerindians of the Plains and their ultimate subjugation).11

As a recent Lincoln defender has noted in apparent agreement (and beginning here research by modern scholars will be cited and quoted in support of the author’s contrary views):

 In welding the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution⎯

 in effect, making the Declaration a constitutional document⎯

 Lincoln created a different sort of constitutionalism in American

 public life. Prior to 1854, Americans were wont to define

 ‘constitutionalism’ merely along the narrow grounds of federal/

 state relations, separation of powers within the document, and

 the strict/broad construction debate that had roiled American public

 life since the days of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson.

 These were all serious, important constitutional issues, but they

 were of limited use to a man like Abraham Lincoln: an anti-

 slavery man who had to avoid identification with radical abolitionists,

 but who nevertheless wanted to enter the political fray armed with

 practical, useful tools to combat the institution of slavery⎯the

 greatest moral question of his age. Understanding that arguments

 on a strictly moral plane [idealistically in Romantic perfectionist terms]

 could only carry him so far; that indeed the vast majority of

 white Americans were inclined to reject strictly abstract moral

 arguments against slavery out of hand due to the prevailing racial

prejudice of American life. Lincoln needed a sort of

hybrid constitutionalism, one that could appeal at once to the

Constitution and to America’s innate moral sensibilities. It

needed to do so with politically viable, easily recognizable s

ymbols that could be integrated with, rather than set in opposition

to, the American constitutional tradition. The Declaration

admirably served this purpose.

That is, the Declaration interpreted anew by Lincoln and the Republicans and the abolitionists before them! According to Brian R. Dirck, “[H]e always thought the Union they [the Founders] created in Philadelphia in 1787 (which he habitually collapsed into the Union created by the Declaration of Independence was by definition a national community that was fundamentally incompatible with human bondage, just as a cancerous tumor was incompatible with a human body.”)12

Myth-making, as Prof. Marc Ferro reminds us in *The Use and Abuse of History* (London, 1984), is a(n) almost universal phenomenon engaged in by all peoples and societies be it American, African, Asian Indian, Arabic, Islamic, Armenian, or European. Among the reasons cited by Prof. Ferro for this long-lived practice are (1) the need to ennoble the past by ignoring more sordid events and developments (as with the origin of the caste system in India); (2) to establish continuity and uniformity in ideology and political rule (as in Communist Russia and among Muslims); (3) to explain away a debilitating past and/or to avoid troublesome issues; (4) to promote nationalism and patriotism; and (5) to justify war and imperialism. This list of causal factors in the myth-making process applies as well to the North during the antebellum period. Referring to America, Michael Kammen has observed that “. . . every nation needs a mythic explanation of its own creation . . . . Consequently, the sectional crises of antebellum times caused the founders of the Union to receive an unusual degree of adulation . . . . The authors of nineteenth-century schoolbooks accentuated the phenomenon by indulging in what has been called ‘indoctrination in national traditions.’” While studies of American myths abound, their larger political meaning has heretofore escaped notice and particularly application to Abraham Lincoln and the new Republican party.13

 Further than general descriptions of Romantic history usually admit, its essential purpose was always presentist, i.e., to seek out and identify those elements of the past that united a people culturally and politically and presaged the creation of a nation. As expressed by Johann Herder and other Germanic writers, in the wake of the wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon between 1792 and 1815, the idea of the state or nation became the best means for the fulfillment of a new society and government. So it was for Lincoln and Republicans who also confronted a more practical need to legitimize as *American* what were really radical and foreign “isms,” not only democracy (as majoritarianism) but egalitarianism (that also encompassed abolitionism) and nationalism. What better way to effect this historical revisionism to advance the perfection of America and overcome limited original intentions than to impute to the eighteenth-century American founders and framers ideas and beliefs of nineteenth-century origin. In effect, they became what they were not⎯confirmed democrats, egalitarians, abolitionists, and nationalists!14

 At the same time, and to counter the Southern claim (along with the other North) that they were the true heirs to the more limited and less expansive principles of 1776 and 1787, Lincoln and Republicans also expanded the myth of a “Slave Power” to identify the cause of the South (and their Northern supporters) with the defense of slavery alone beyond original intentions that were now reinterpreted to be quite different ones. After 1854, the threat to the nation became the rejection of equal rights as “glittering generalities” by Democrats in the North and South alike. (Much as historians have documented the North-South debate about 1776 and 1787 in the early national and antebellum eras, they have presumed that it was the South doing the misinterpreting.)15

 With Romantic and revisionist purposes very much in mind, Lincoln and the Republicans claimed that the Union was older than the states and that the real charter of America’s national government was the Declaration of Independence more so than the later and flawed Constitution (that Southerners and their Northern allies held to be sacrosanct). Unlike the Constitution, the Declaration also committed the new nation or so Lincoln and Republicans claimed, *incorrectly*, to a universal principle of liberty and equality for all men! That union, or the indissoluble union that was supposed to be, had to be restored to remove the foul stain of slavery on the body politic. This required, of course, a new founding despite their rhetoric to the contrary about preserving the union of old (the continuation of which , after all, would mean acquiescence in slavery and freedom coexisting)*.*16

 More than a sectional conflict between a North and a South and between freedom versus slavery, it was really one between two different Americas, one born in the eighteenth century and represented by the Old South so-called and an old North (we forget) and another one in the making born in the half-century of revolution between 1815-1865 and symbolized by the rise of a new Republican party led by Abraham Lincoln (that had no relation at all to the first Republican party of Madison and Jefferson of the 1790’s). While the former America embodied the original beliefs of the founders (1776) and framers (1787-1788), that were by no means democratic, egalitarian, abolitionist, or nationalist, the latter espoused all of these newer “isms” of nineteenth century and foreign origin (traceable to the second and radical French Revolution of 1792-1794 led by Jacobins culminating in a “Reign of Terror”) that directly challenged the Whig-republican-federalist-states’ rights-limited citizenship-equality of opportunity and anti-slavery (emancipation gradually) views of the founding generation, North and South, that were quite liberal and enlightened by eighteenth century standards. (According to Howard Mumford Jones, “An immense transformation overtook Western culture at the end of the eighteenth century . . . Although it occurred only a decade later, the French Revolution seems to have taken place in another age from that of the American Revolution. American leaders like Washington or John Adams remained in the classical domain while French leaders like Marat or Robespierre and later Napoleon more and more took on the character of the romantic *moi* . . .”)17

 America’s Civil War of 1861-1865 was very much about original versus different intentions⎯politically, socially, constitutionally, theologically, and philosophically⎯identified here broadly as early American enlightened republicanism informed by a realistic and Calvinist conception of human nature as more evil than good versus a later Romantic conception of society, government, and politics that presumed human perfectionism and proceeding from this radical insight (of Jean-Jacques Rousseau interpreted by Robespierre and the Jacobins of the second and radical French Revolution) led to a questioning of and dissatisfaction with existing ideas and institutions that enslaved humans rather than liberated them. In Rousseau’s famous words, “Men are Free but everywhere in chains.” Spread throughout Europe first by conquering soldiers of the first French Republic and later by Napoleon’s armies between 1803 and 1814, more radical (French) notions of liberty, government, and society including democracy, egalitarianism, abolitionism, nationalism, and anti-clericalism were revived as Romanticism in Germany to inspire further programs for reform and independence well into the nineteenth century including the United States (as a federal republic and not yet united). The later economic revolution of industrialism further contributed to a great contest of ideas and struggle for power between eighteenth-century liberals, conservatives (monarchists, aristocrats, and industrial-capitalists), and radicals (democrats, socialists, and nationalists) in Europe and the Americas (South and North).18

 Buffeted by the twin revolutions of Romanticism and Industrialism after 1815, Europeans experienced their own contest of ideas and struggle for power among competing political and social groups during the “Age of Revolution and Reaction.” On one side were the conservatives seeking to maintain the status quo against the liberal and radical demands of democrats, republicans, and socialists. In Europe, the forces for and against change clashed dramatically in the attempted revolutions of 1848. Scared as hell at the thought of another French Revolution, the conservatives enacted reforms (political, constitutional, and social) from above to prevent revolution from below. The result there was not civil war(s) but the responsive conservative and unified state! 19

In America, the conservatives were the Democrats, North and South, who as republicans of old continued to espouse more limited views of government and restricted citizenship and suffrage, and slavery’s gradual abolition by personal preference and state action according to popular sovereignty locally together with colonization and territorial diffusion to lessen the reality of race. In relations between capital and labor, their sympathies were with the former rather than the latter who were seen more as radical workingmen demanding rights. Democrats, egalitarians, and abolitionists they were not. Nor were they nationalists as statists willing to use coercive power to achieve utopian dreams. Radical reform of America was not needed. Even with slavery, America remained the most free country in the world and its unique experiment in republican government on an extended basis

 was a model to be emulated. In 1948, Roy F. Nichols stated more than he realized when writing that “the [founding] fathers saw no need to use the term [democracy] in the official language describing their handiwork.” “The United States, usually then a plural word ‘were’ referred to as a federal system, a confederacy, or a republic, but not as a democracy.” “Members of the American Democracy,” moreover, were fighting democracy.” The new Republicans were the real “democrats” and more. (*The Disruption of American Democracy* [New York, 1948], p. 7.) Reflecting later on his career as a historian, Nichols made some other forward looking observations. “I had come to the conclusion that historians tend to work and think in terms of time spans, often denotes as epoch and eras, which are too short to enable them to define meaningful stages in the history of the evolution of human behavior.” The interests of historians “should be fitted into a long chronology” which Nichols called “the Anglo-American concept.” Later, he added, “that those studying the American Civil War would gain much by considering it in its setting in the history of Western civilization as a whole.”20

 Viewed in the context of World History between 1789 and 1865, what was happening in America in the North (or a part of it) was similar to a larger pattern of revolution, reform, and unification as least with respect to the final unification of Italy in 1870 and Germany in 1871 (although in other ways nationalist aspirations were not always successful and in fact helped contribute to the defeat of liberals and radicals in 1848). Only in America did the radicals as Romantic-perfectionist-nationalists triumph with the rise of a new Republic party and the election of Abraham Lincoln as its second presidential candidate in 1860. As democrats nationalists, and abolitionists if not racial egalitarians, who also embraced the nascent labor movement (redefined to be less radical than the early workingmen’s movement of the Jacksonian era), their astuteness in fashioning a new political coalition and campaign about “Free Soil, Free Labor, and Free Men” proved to be a brilliant strategy politically. Successfully combining Northern racial prejudice with the exaggerated threat of slavery’s expansion that the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 did not presage, the new party avoided the question of what to do with the Negro (beyond keeping him out of the territories) while waging war against the South and slavery. In terms of Romantic philosophy, the nationalist imperative became paramount over the perfectionist impulses (abolition and black equality). Only by establishing a unified nation could the further perfection of America proceed further to emancipation and beyond. Unlike the anarchist-Garrisonian-immediate abolitionists, who advocated disunion rather than union with slaveholders, Lincoln and Republicans preferred an altogether new union. To David Goldfield, “America’s Romantic Age had produced a Civil War.”21

History Revised: 1776 and Equality over Independence

 After 1854 and Kansas-Nebraska, “Lincoln went to war against slavery.” Emerging “out of a semiretirement [sic] from politics,” he “reentered the fray, armed with a powerful, morally righteous anger against slavery, and equally powerful constitutional arguments to combat the institution and hopefully set it . . . ‘in [the] course of ultimate extinction.” If “Lincoln of the 1840s and early 1850s had not put much effort or energy into developing a coherent antislavery ideology,” neither did “he press his antislavery convictions to the point of a radical antislavery reading of the Constitution. Or at least, he would not do before 1854.”22

 Lincoln hated slavery. Even before the Civil War and his eventual

 role as the Great Emancipator, his speeches and letters were

 littered with tart references to the peculiar institution: “All

 agreed that slavery was an evil’; ‘the most dumb and stupid

 Ssave that ever toiled for a master, does constantly know that he

 is wronged’; ‘although volume upon volume is written to prove

 slavery a very good thing, we never hear of the man who wishes

to take the good of it, by being a slave himself’; ‘If A. can prove,

however conclusively, that he may, of right, enslave B.⎯why may

not B. snatch the same argument, and prove equally, that he may

enslave A?’ ‘I have always hated slavery, as much as I think as any

abolitionist . . . .

For Lincoln and a minority of other opponents of slavery, there was not much they could do. A federal consensus had emerged since the Constitution was ratified that the American republic could coexist as half-slave and half-free until slavery could be abolished peaceably sometime in the future. If immediate abolition as advocated by radical Garrisonians was out of the question, so too was direct action against slavery on the part of the federal government beyond the District of Columbia. Accurately summarizing the rejection by anti-abolitionists, North and South, of radical immediate emancipation that Garrison and his followers preached, Prof. Dirck observes:

 But the vast majority of Americans⎯even those who

 didn’t like slavery⎯weren’t so sure. Allow Washington

 to reach directly into the slaveholding states and interfere

 with a system of labor that touched upon the daily lives of

 millions of Americans, black and white, despite state laws and

 regulations to the contrary? Not many people were inclined to

 begin the slide down that slippery slope. If the federal government

 could thus run roughshod over white Southern sensibilities, where

 would it end? The national government would in effect be the

 arbiter of its own authority, unchecked by average citizens or

 the language of the Constitution. ‘The principle and con-

 struction . . . that the general government is the exclusive judge

 of the extent of the powers delegated to it, stop nothing short of

 despotism,’ argued Thomas Jefferson in the Kentucky Resolution

of 1799, ‘since the discretion of those who administer

the government, and not the constitution, would be the

measure of their powers.’

Even those people not otherwise inclined to agree with Jefferson

on most matters were generally in agreement on this subject . While

there were plenty of nationalistic Americans ⎯supporters of

Alexander Hamilton and his Federalist Party in the early decades of the nation’s existence, and later the Whigs⎯even the most fervent

believers in a strong federal regime nevertheless felt the day-to-

day functions of governing America must remain in local hands.

Americans consequently saw to it that the federal government had

almost no direct relevance in their lives.

When Lincoln co-sponsored an anti-slavery petition to the Illinois state legislature in 1837, the report being protested concluded that however repugnant slavery was “the arm of the general Government has no power to strike their fetters from them.”23

What Lincoln and Republicans needed to do after 1854 was to overcome original intentions and “to craft a new constitutional vision of the United States, potent not only in its use as a moral weapon to hammer [Senator] Douglas and popular sovereignty’s supporters in 1854, but also as a constitutional blueprint for America’s future. He needed a constitutional vision that could be at once practical, politically viable, and morally relevant.” Having “barely mentioned the Declaration at all” prior to 1854, Lincoln all of a sudden looked to 1776 and “connected Thomas Jefferson’s ringing declaration of human equality to the cause of ending American slavery.”24

Lincoln’s new history for a new nation in the making began with a radical reinterpretation of the Declaration as a promise of the equal rights of all men and beyond independence as merely a “revolutionary” doctrine (a very important distinction that would serve a later purpose to reject Southern secession as a right of revolution also derived from the same Declaration of 1776 and its principal purpose historically). “Now Lincoln added in 1854 a new component, one that gave his Constitutional vision an added moral impetus while still grounding it in pragmatism and tapping into the shared reverence felt by Lincoln and his contemporaries for the Revolutionary generation: the Declaration of Independence.”

Whatever its source [his own veneration of the Framers generally

 or the writings of some antislavery activists like Lysander Spooner],

 Lincoln’s invocation of the Declaration was a specific choice, one that

 flew directly in the face of other Americans (chief Justice of the Supreme

 Court Roger Taney, for example) who went out of their way to limit the

 Declaration’s power and scope as much as possible⎯the better to

 place African Americans beyond the pale of its protection. Lincoln’s

 thinking traveled in exactly the opposite direction. His reading of the

 Declaration was expansive enough to include not only African Americans,

 but immigrants of different ethnic backgrounds, as well, a position that

 placed him firmly on the progressive end of antebellum American

 politics. ‘Our Declaration of Independence was held sacred by all, and

 thought to include all,’ he declared.

“A reverence for that founding moment,” however, remained powerful” for the people of the South as well as the North as Nicole Etchison reminds us albeit with a difference. To the former, 1776 was about independence as a “revolutionary” principle that Lincoln denied.25

The Real Paradox of Lincolnian-Republican Racism and Equality

For all of their rhetoric about the equal rights of all men, that they derived from a reinterpretation of the Declaration (that was originally about independence more than equality or even democracy), Lincoln and Republicans were by no means “racial egalitarians” as modern scholars agree (George M. Frederickson, Eric Foner, Henry L. Gates, Jr. Brian R. Dirck, Nicole Etchison, Paul D. Escott, Marc Egnal, and Mark Graber to name a few). Much as they appealed to a more egalitarian Declaration 1776 than was intended by the founders, their own racism and black prejudice inhibited any embrace of full equality for blacks. The principle of non-extension, expressed in the new Republican party slogan of “Free Soil, Free Labor, and Free Men,” was most definitely racist and clearly meant no blacks at all in the new territories whether slave or free and no amount of historical white-washing can change this inescapable reality as fact. To quote Brian R. Dirck again, Lincoln in the 1850’s “was not much of a racial egalitarian” and repeatedly denied that he or his party had any purpose “to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races.” As he adds, Lincoln’s statements “concerning race and social equality . . . are carefully circumscribed, and confusing. Even today, it is difficult to tell whether or not Lincoln actually believed in the possibility of a racially diverse America.”26

Even when Lincoln mentioned equal rights, he limited them to “natural rights” only thus backpedaling “from any suggestion that either he or his party had ever endorsed racial equality.” As he admitted, “There is a physical difference between the two, which in my judgment will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality . . . .” “Notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I hold that he I as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my equal in many respects⎯certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, *he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man.* What this “free labor” argument meant for the negro was not clear. Did he choose “to conceal, as a matter of political expedience, a private conviction that someday at least slavery would disappear and be replaced by some measure of racial equality. Or may he have been “genuinely troubled and skeptical about even the barest possibility of a racially diverse America”? To George M. Frederickson, however, the meaning was more clear. For Lincoln, it meant that the negro may have been “a man” but he was not yet “a brother. 27

Lincoln’s confusing and contradictory ideas “concerning race and racial equality” did serve another mythical purpose and point about the renewed slavery controversy after 1854. Without having to admit their own racism, or committing themselves to the abolition of slavery in defense of black equality, Lincoln and the Republicans cleverly turned the debate about the future of slavery and of slaves to be more about the denial of the Declaration’s promise of equality by Douglas and Democrats in general, North.28

 Lincoln worked this theme time and again, both during

 the debate and afterwards. Douglas and his supporters

 were engaged in a disturbing campaign to gut the Declaration

 of its original, inclusive meaning and purpose⎯the

 eventual demise of slavery. ‘If they would repress all

 tendencies to liberty and ultimate emancipation, they must

 go back to the era of our independence and muzzle the

 cannon which thundered its annual joyous returns on the

 Fourth of July; they must blow out the moral lights around us;

 they must penetrate the human soul and eradicate the love of

 liberty,” Lincoln declared. In so doing, Douglas and his

 supporters would dehumanize African Americans,” ‘teaching that

 the negro is no longer a man but a brute; that the Declaration has

 nothing to do with him; that he ranks with the crocodile and the

 reptile; that man, with body and soul, is a matter of dollars and

 cents.’

Going beyond altruism, Lincoln appealed to his white voters’ self-interest. Today, Douglas reads African Americans out of the

Declaration, Lincoln pointed out; tomorrow, they could be next.

‘When you have stricken down the principles of the Declaration

of Independence, and thereby consigned the negro to hopeless

and eternal bondage, are you quite sure that the demon will not

turn and rend you? . . . . Will not the people then be ready to go

down beneath the tread of any tyrant who may wish to rule them?’

(Dirck, p. 47; see also George Frederickson, *The Arrogance of Race*,

66.)

The threat that slavery posed to America was not its expansion based on plantation agriculture (that even Republicans admitted would not happen because of “Natural Limits”). It was now the more open and explicit denial of the equal rights of all men by Democrats, North and South, that threatened free white labor in the North by reactionary beliefs in submission, subjugation and the ownership of man as property. Here was the new national threat to freedom that slavery posed by its very existence in America even if constitutionally protected in the South. So long as slavery persisted, so too would inequality be defended. (In the context of 1776, however, “the declaration was not yet regarded as the charter of American democracy . . . . Here, Douglas came close to the majority opinion in Congress in 1776, whereas Lincoln, who was probably unaware of the textual history of the Declaration, echoed the early minority opinion [about equal rights for all men including black Americans].)29

By making the “popular sovereignty” theory of Stephen A. Douglas into a default pro-slavery proposition, Lincoln and Republicans were able to link Northern Democrats to Southern slaveholders in a “Slave Power Conspiracy” to expand the “peculiar institution” nationally and to subvert what to Lincoln and Republicans was the Founders’ promise of equal rights of all men that they proclaimed in 1776. In Lincoln’s historical fable, his Founders were reluctant “enablers of an institution that they secretly detested.” “Necessity drove them so far, and farther they would not go . . . . They hedged and hemmed it in to the narrowest limits of necessity.” Instead of freedom being *national* and slavery *sectiona*l, these founding purposes had become reversed.30

“His statements in 1858 are limited on personal and political levels.

But as a statement of basic principles, his language reveals a legitimate commitment to a constitutionalism that carried within itself the promise of progress. To his mind, the Declaration did not commit the nation to enacting racial equality in 1858; it did, however, commit the nation to a timeless, universal principle of human equality towards which Americans could and should thrive. Here was a potent doctrine, particularly compared to the fossilized originalism of Roger Taney’s constitutionalism, which would have permanently defined Americans according to the worst racist angels of their natures. Taney’s constitutionalism was the wagon without the horses. By comparison, Lincoln’s vision was evolutionary, carrying the potential for future, fundamental change.”

The Republican Paradox of Racism and Equaliity Resolved:

Nationalism over Equality

 A national solution was needed to resolve the problem of slavery. Not only did the territories have to be reclaimed as free soil by national prohibition, but there had to be a new birth of freedom in the form of a new nation finally rid of the moral evil of slavery defined as the ownership of humans as property without any commitment to equal rights for blacks.31

Our republican robe is soiled, and trailed in the dust [by

popular sovereignty and proslavery supporters]. . . . Let us

repurify it. Let us turn and wash it white, in the spirit, if

not the blood, of the Revolution . . . . Let us re-adopt the

Declaration of Independence, and with it, the practices,

and policy, which harmonize with it. Let north and south⎯

let all Americans⎯let all lovers of liberty everywhere

not only have saved the Union; but we shall have so saved it,

as to make, and to keep it, forever worthy of the saving.

 “By connecting the Declaration directly to government, rather than the abstract ideal of ‘all men are created equal,’” Lincoln did more than “locate the document in the Constitution’s neighborhood” (as Prof. Dirck understates it). He was making the Declaration superior to the Constitution as the charter of a national government and the foundation of a new nation united by the principle of “liberty to all” which gives hope to all . . . and, by consequence, enterprise [sic], and industry to all . . .” To Lincoln’s way of thinking anew, “the Declaration had served as a vital unifying influence for the patriots of 1776, for it gave them something tangible around which to rally.” ‘No oppressed people will fight and endure, as our fathers did, without the promise of something better, than a mere change of masters.’ For a second time, Lincoln denied the Revolution as a War of Independence.32

 The emerging myth of a “Slave Power” would prove highly useful in uniting the coalition of anti-slavery Whigs and Democrats opposed to the Kansas-Nebraska Act into a new political party by identifying as proslavery the Northern allies of the South who alike denied the opposing claim that the Declaration of 1776 was about equal rights for all men above independence and self-government for whites only. They also favored the expansion of slavery (by merely advocating for popular sovereignty that permitted a territory to vote for or against slavery however unlikely an outcome in favor would be and that Douglas believed “was the least controversial means for obtaining free states”). The emergence of a “Slave Power” further signaled the end of any hope that slavery had been on a path to ultimate extinction. The era of compromises with slavery was over, too. Why agree to an extension of the Missouri Compromise line that Kansas-Nebraska had just repealed?33

 In addition to the myth of a “Slave Power,” the Republican party also claimed the Declaration of Independence to be the charter of a national government that could act upon the new conviction that America had to cease being half slave and half free as Lincoln underscored in his “House Divided” speech of 1858. Being superior to the Constitution, the Declaration’s dual commitment to freedom over slavery and a national polity over a federal one, released it from a pledge not to interfere with slavery where it existed legally under the old Constitution. For a new birth of freedom to occur, a new union was required with a new constitution. The South had to be made in the image of the free North. Once slavery was abolished, so too would the new nation be rid of disunionist ideas and aristocratic rule by the few over the many that slavery necessarily encouraged, actually in practice and philosophically as a master-subject relation extending to the political realm.34

 Moving beyond non-extensionism by Congressional or national prohibition, Lincoln by 1858 had assumed a more radical position of a fundamental and irreconcilable struggle between freedom and slavery. At Alton, Illinois in 1858, in one of a series of debates with Senator Stephen A. Douglas, did he define “the real issue in this controversy.” The difference between Republicans and Democrats, he declared, and “the one pressing upon every mind⎯is the sentiment on the part of one class that looks upon the institution of slavery *as a wrong*, and of another class that *does not* look upon it as a wrong.”35

 The myth of a “Slave Power” is used here appropriately because Lincoln and Republicans first of all exaggerated the threat of slavery’s westward expansion by the spread of plantation agriculture just as they made the denial of equal rights by Douglas and Democrats the equivalent of a proslavery argument that threatened free white labor in the North. As a collective symbol of evil and retrogression, abolition as the end of legal slavery was an end in itself and did not mean equal rights for blacks. Abolition meant *freedom only* for blacks and nothing more. Conceding “that African Americans would remain second-class citizens, ” Lincoln was not ready to “take a quixotic tilt at racism’s impregnable windmill, at least not in 1858. ‘I believe the declaration that “all men are created equal” is the great fundamental principle upon which our free institutions rest, but it does not follow that social and political equality between blacks and whites must be incorporated, because slavery must not. The declaration does not so require.’” Romantically speaking, Lincoln, Republicans, and the abolitionists before them were the real abstractionists! To Alexander H. Stephens, “The Union with him [Lincoln], in sentiment, rose to the sublimity of a religious mysticism.”36

 Secondly, Lincoln and Republicans (and abolitionists before them) were the ones guilty of historical revisionism for political purposes by reading backward in time a later egalitarian purpose that was not present in 1776. In eighteenth-century terms, the republic was for citizens only and not even all white males were included. If the founders meant the Declaration to be about the equal rights of all men, as Lincoln said they did, why did they not go ahead and abolish slavery? What prevented them for not going any farther than they did? In actuality, the reverse is more true historically. To quote another liberal and mainstream historian, Gordon S. Wood, “We know it [the Declaration] did not mean that blacks and women were equal to white men although it would be in time used to justify these equalities too.” In an editorial on July 4, 1997, discerning syndicated columnist William Raspberry (now deceased) observed that “We know the celebration wasn’t planned with us [African Americans] in mind. But then, there are lots of other Americans who weren’t on the minds of the authors of the Declaration of Independence.” Writing thirty years earlier, Bernard Bailyn underscored the reality of inequality in the context of a more limited meaning of liberty. “The leaders of the Revolutionary movement . . . were eighteenth-century radicals concerned, like the eighteenth-century English radicals, not with the need to recast the social order nor the problems of economic inequality and the injustices of stratified societies but with the need to purify a corrupt constitution and fight off the apparent growth of prerogative power.” To David Brion Davis, “an additional factor defined the limits of he limits of revolutionary ideology . . . . Like their English contemporaries, the American colonists equated social responsibility with independence, and independence with land ownership. They feared and mistrusted men, regardless of race, who lacked any tangible stake in society.”37

 Reviewing *For Liberty and Equality: The Life and Times of the Declaration of Independence* by Alexander Tsesis for *The New Republic*, Prof. Jack N. Rakove of Stanford University observes that the author’s “premise and his story is profoundly Lincolnian.” “In short, Tsesis collapses into the Declaration a host of claims that text and context simply cannot support, assigning to it qualities and purposes it was not originally intended or understood to possess [i. e., the authentic principles of the American republic and the creation of a unified national government].” “Americans have long read that [‘all men are created equal’] to mean that we are or should become equal to one another as citizens. That, in effect, is how we have democratized the Constitution since 1776 as Tsesis ably demonstrates not merely because the inequalities are unjust in themselves, but also because we believe that the Declaration instructs us to oppose them.” Yet “the intended meaning of 1776 was never about inequality within American society. It was instead a statement that Americans as a people, as a collective whole, were equally endowed with other peoples with the right to oppose tyranny, to ‘alter and abolish’ unjust governments and establish new governments in their stead. This form of equality means little to us now, but in the revolutionary circumstances of 1776, that was the equality Americans needed to assert.”38

For her part, Prof. Pauline Maier again makes the critical distinction that the equal rights of man “had originally referred to men in a state of nature, that is, before government existed.” Later on, after noting many “state and local declarations of Independence,” these together with the one of 1776 “suggested enough different meanings of the word ‘equality’—equal rights, equal access to office, equal voting power —to keep Americans busy sorting them out and fighting over practices that seemed inegalitarian far into the future.” For that matter, “The Declaration of Independence was, in fact, a peculiar document to be cited by those championed the cause of equality. Not only did its reference to men’s equal creation concern people in a state of nature before government was established, but the document’s original function was to end the previous regime, not to lay down principles to guide and limit its successor.”39

No “Glittering Generalities” and No Great Reaction

 Quite simply, there was no “Great Reaction” in the South or the other North before the Civil War. There was not because those “glittering generalities” of the equal rights of men were not present at the birth of the republic for them to deny. “ “Equality then, like democracy, is a word-concept whose meaning and value were perceived more narrowly two hundred years ago than they are today.” “The South, in accepting slavery, did not reject republicanism.” “It was not the attitude . . . of slaveholders that changed between the 1790’s and 1830’s, but rather the attitude of the North.” Put another way, it was not the South that changed its beliefs before 1860; rather, the principles of 1776 and 1787 were themselves reinterpreted for other intentions (perfecting the Republic by abolishing slavery and above all making it a nation united). About America’s most famous state paper, the South was right after all. It was not about equal rights for all men (neither white or black and most certainly not for women). Taking exception to many historians of the South, Larry E. Tise rejects “the conventional wisdom that has grown up about proslavery” that has “assumed that southern slaveholders were in the vanguard of those lwho leaped to the defense of slavery in the nineteenth century . . . . Nor was “southern proslavery . . . an aberrant form of social thinking limited in time and space to the Old South.” From 1701-1840, “Americans had a rich and telling proslavery history from their colonial and revolutionary years prior to the emergence of the Old South.”40

 It should be noted, however, that Tise posits a more crucial conservative “counterrevolution,” North and South, that had disturbing consequences for the American republic. Beginning with the Federalists in the 1790’s, in reaction to the more radical second French Revolution of the Jacobins, and continuing to influence the anti-abolitionist movement in the North and then the antebellum South, the promise of the Revolution for a more democratic, egalitarian, and inclusive American society was almost subverted by “a reactionary critique of anything that smacked of being French or Jeffersonian.” America “came dangerously close to losing its liberating and liberalizing tendencies in the first half of the nineteenth century . . . [W]e are fortunate that the near national acquiescence with slavery as a morally acceptable institution, which conservative counterrevolutionaries North and South almost achieved, was finally shattered in the clash of sectional war.” (I defer to the experts cited in notes 37-49 above and in “A Declaration of Independence Not Equality: Historians Tell the Truth About 1776” at www.nullificationhistory.com.)41

On the other side, “Convinced that their democracy was, in Abraham Lincoln’s words, ‘the last, best hope on earth,’ northerners could no more allow the secession of the southern states in 1861 than they could permit the South to remain in the Union unchanged.” If the “North came increasingly to interpret the Declaration of Independence as the nation’s ‘mission statement’ . . . . ,” for the South it became “an insurance policy against the encroachments of centralized power.” The right of revolution against a government about to become contrary to their welfare and rights was “more important . . . than the ‘life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness’ philosophy that, Lincoln argued, informed America’s national doctrine.”Ominously, “’Northern” and “America’ now seemed interchangeable terms.”42

 When Southerners and their Northern allies called the new party of Lincoln “black republicans,” they were accurate in their assessment. In 1854, an Ohio newspaper of Democratic persuasion (the New Albany *Daily Ledger*) stated that it was “the design of the free-soil party of the North to endeavor to form a great sectional organization, having for its object the abolition of slavery in the Southern states.” In 1862, Theodore Tilton, “an associate of Republicans and Garrisonians alike⎯explained the conflict with three simple premises: ‘There is war because there was a Republican party. There was a Republican party because there was an Abolition party. There was an Abolition party because there was slavery.’” “Many, if not all white Southerners saw few differences among a Garrison, a Lincoln, and a Nat Turner.” “In a new account of slavery’s destruction, [James] Oakes argues that Republican policies on slavery before and during the Civil War were directly ‘inherited from the antislavery movement,’ and that contemporaries well understood this. According to Oakes [*Freedom National: The Destruction of Slavery in the United States, 1861-1865* [New York, 2013], the Republicans’ resolve to ‘denationalize’ slavery (whether by containment in peacetime or emancipation in war} gave southern slaveholders sound reasons to fear that Lincoln’s election threatened their institutions.”43

 Abolitionism was just one symptom of the wider embrace by “fanatics” and “Jacobins” in the North of radical French ideas of democratic and egalitarian liberty and other utopian “isms.” If “fanaticism” is defined by “being governed by an ideal” as Emerson characterized John Brown, then there is real substance to the use of these meaningful references to the second French Revolution of 1792-1794 and the “Reign of Terror” it became. In the spring of 1848, when “the French Second Republic attempted to extend the revolution from political change to social overhaul, instituting guarantees of work, shorter workdays, and public relief projects and also abolished slavery in the French West Indies, Southerners easily identified “events in Europe with disdained Northern ‘-isms’.” To Langdon Cheves of South Carolina, free-soilers for the moment only desired to “pen [slavery up] within restricted limits.” But fanaticism “has no stopping place.”44

Since the Greek war for independence in the 1820’s and the 1830 revolution in France, “great social upheavals in Europe” sounded alarm bells in the South. 1848 promised more of the same. To Sen. Willie Mangum of North Carolina, “the heart of Europe quakes in fear of the unknown future.” As summarized by Eugene D. and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, “The masses⎯unprepared for manly liberty⎯were rising, and Mangum saw war as well as revolution threatening to engulf Europe.” With all of “the wild and unsustainable schemes of radicals like Ladru-Rollin, Blanc, and Pierre Joseph Proudhon,” a Northern writer in *DeBow’s Review* declared “’The French Revolution of 1848 was a beautiful illusion⎯a Platonic dream.’” To James M. McPherson:

The accession to power of the Republican party, with its

ideology of competitive, egalitarian, free labor capitalism,

was a signal to the South that the northern majority

had turned irrevocably toward this frightening, revolutionary

future. Indeed, the Black Republican party appeared to the

 eyes of many southerners as ‘essentially a revolutionary

party’ composed of ‘a motley throng of Sans culottes . . . Infidels

and freelovers, interspersed by Bloomer women,

fugitive slaves, and amalgamationists.’ Therefore secession

was a pre-emptive counterrevolution to prevent the Black

Republican revolution from engulfing the South.

‘We are not revolutionists,’ insisted James B. D. DeBow and Jefferson Davis during the Civil War. ‘We are resisting revolution . . .

We are conservative.’

Like “black Republicanism,” abolitionists posed the threat it did in the 1830’s because it also embodied other dangerous ideas about government, society, and politics imported from Europe but identified with French Jacobins and revolutionaries whose radical notions of infidelity and atheism and democracy, equality, and emancipation “had infected the Western world” ever since 1789.45

 “The revolutions of 1848 delighted the abolitionists.” As violence between free-soil and pro-slavery forces escalated in Kansas, and the federal government intervened to sustain law and order, free-soilers became the “Kossuths of Kansas” fighting not only pro-slavery Missourians, but federal troops, “which, like the forces of Russia, represented the interests of a distant authoritarian government.” Under the sway of the “Slave Power,” government in America had become despotic, President Franklin Pierce, as the “tool of the Slave Power,” needed to be removed as one step “of a revolution . . . to throw off the chains of a slaveholding oligarchy a thousand times more intolerable . . .than any ever imposed upon our Revolutionary forbears by the mother country.” Indeed, the conflict in Kansas was a clash between “two nations “ and two different civilizations. “In such a clash antislavery forces became the forces of revolution, attempting, as had many European revolutionaries, to match geographic boundaries with nationalistic identity.” In explaining “much of the conflict that eventually led to war,” Southern leaders referenced “the runaway democracy of Northern states.” “Northern society was unsettled and disorganized; it encouraged bizarre beliefs and undesirable reform movements. Abolitionism, socialism, women’s rights, French theories of social reform known as Fourierism, and other kinds of ‘isms’ earned frequent denunciation by Southern spokesmen.”46

1848 and the Revolution of 1860:

War against the South

 To make another connection with events in Europe, the nationalist imperative that would inspire Lincoln and the Republicans was influenced by the Revolutions of 1848 in Europe or rather the failure of these revolutions by 1852 that did not achieve liberal or radical reforms or unification. If the forces of conservatism and reaction were reasserting themselves in Europe, so too was the advance of slavery and the “Slave Power” in America as events between 1850 and 1860 would demonstrate (referred to as “the sequence” by James L. Huston in “Interpreting the Causation Sequence: The Meaning of the Events Leading to the Civil War,” *Reviews in American History*, 34[September 2006], 324-331). Repeatedly, between 1854 and 1860, did Lincoln and the Republicans refer to an “Irrepressible Conflict” between freedom and slavery that was also part of a larger on-going struggle in Europe between believers in the “axioms of free society (associated with Jefferson and his Declaration) and those seeking to supplant “the principles of free government, and restoring those of classification, caste, and legitimacy.” Citing those in America, North and South, who deny the principles of Jefferson⎯”One dashingly calls them ‘glittering generalities’; another calls them ‘self evident lies’; and still others insidiously argue that they apply only to the ‘superior races’. . .” Lincoln declared that “These expressions, differing in form, are identical in object and effect” that “would delight a convocation of crowned heads, plotting against the people.” These “are the van-guard⎯the miners, and sappers⎯of returning despotism. We must repulse them, or they will subjugate us.”47

 Very much in Romantic and perfectionist terms, Lincoln continued. “This is a world of compensations; and he who would *be* no slave, must consent *to have* no slave. Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, can not long retain it.” Then, reinterpreting Jefferson to make him one of them, and his Declaration to mean what it did not originally, Lincoln called the American Revolution “*a struggle for national independence by a single people*. (Italics added) “All honor to Jefferson⎯to the man who, in the concrete pressure [of the times] . . . had the coolness, forecast [foresight], and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document [that legitimized a right of revolution], an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there, that to-day, and in all coming days, it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling block to the very harbingers of re-appearing tyranny and oppression [as in Europe].”48

 A new party was needed to arrest the spread of despotism here beginning with restricting the spread of slavery into the territories. Transforming the Declaration of Independence into a “sacred document” with egalitarian and nationalist intentions beyond those of the founders and framers, while serving to link the Republicans to the principles of 1776 and 1787 (by deliberate misinterpretation), still left intact the Southern claim to be the real heirs of the founders and framers. Something else was needed to challenge this assertion. The perception of the South had to be changed from positive (republican and constitutional) to negative (slavery as its central theme and as an aggressive “Slave Power”). By 1860, the myths of democracy and a reactionary South were fully developed to influence the important presidential election of that year and change the course of American history to a final crisis of the union about more than slavery alone.49

 With reference to events in Europe, Timothy Roberts in *Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism* (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2009) concludes that: The 1848 revolutions did not by themselves cause the Civil War, but they did contribute to its timing and its meaning for many Americans.”

 Territorial acquisitions in the 1840’s precipitated a sectional

 political alignment. Outbreaks of violence in the West, a symptom

 of the that alignment, became significant partly because a growing

 number of Americans came to interpret violence⎯a form of

 revolutionary ‘righteous violence’ . . . as signaling how America

 should become more like revolutionary Europe, rather than the other

 way around. Thus, this book shows the role of revolutionary

 events in Europe directing Americans’ path to the Civil War,

 America’s ultimate response to the 1848 revolutions. The United

 States and Europe were drawn closer together, not in the way

 anticipated by Americans who in 1848 professed faith in American exemplarism,” but through shared experiences of nation-building through violence.”

 Moderate as Lincoln was an antislavery advocate, he too (like John Brown and Henry David Thoreau and other radicals) saw “the Republican Party as part of a transatlantic liberal movement, because its ascension to power and the Southern secession that his election precipitated would create the opportunity to save American republicanism.” Lincoln, “both inspired and embarrassed by events in Hungary and elsewhere in Europe a decade before antislavery forces gained power in the United States, thus “became committed to consolidating American power, even at great human sacrifice, so that the country might fulfill its role as a global model.” Exemplified by the “careers of the Hungarian [Kossuth], the Italian [Mazzini], and the American [Lincoln] . . . history does not show popularly accountable government being achieved or sustained without significant violence.”50

 In America, the manifestations of Romanticism (really radical Jacobin libertè, egalitè, and fraternity with secularism and socialist statism) can be followed in the new religion of Unitarianism (original sin denied along with the Trinity and Biblical authority), abolitionism, the working men’s association as an early labor movement of the Age of Jackson (later to become “Free Labor” during the Lincoln-Republican ascendancy), and a new philosophy of Transcendentalism. Early on, the many new “isms” of early nineteenth-century America including democracy or majoritarisnism (and Tocqueville informs us of its emergence then rather than earlier), egalitarianism as universal suffrage and more, Utopianism both as socialism and communism, feminism, and more were disparate social-political-and economic causes and reform movements. Nationalism as the union as absolute, was confined to “King Andrew” (Jackson), whose extreme interpretation of 1787 led to the formation of the new Whig Party of 1833-1860. With the rise of Lincoln and a new Republican party between 1854 and 1860, were Romantic perfectionism and nationalism joined with the latter “ism” being predominant.51

 Instead of recognizing the foreign origin of these newer “isms” (from revolutionary France of the Jacobins and later spread as Romanticism from Germany into America especially after 1815), historians of the Middle Period have interpreted them as expressions of the republic’s liberal founding influenced by an ever expanding frontier environment. Here is Alice Felt Tyler from her 1944 book *Freedom’s Ferment*: “Although the theory of the Revolution was undoubtedly more democratic than its practice, the social and intellectual revolution was as evident as the political, and the Revolutionary years established an American tradition and faith” that made it different it different from Europe. As she admitted, however, “It was a long process of democratization that was begun before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, accelerated by the Revolution and continued through the influence of the frontier.” Quoting Michel Chevalier in 1834, she concluded that American society had become ‘essentially and radically a democracy, not in name merely but in deed.’ Far from being revolutionary, the democratization and further perfection of America was most evolutionary. Other historians have agreed.52

 Looking elsewhere other than the North to explain the origins of our Civil War, modern scholars (following the antebellum creation of a South defined by slavery alone rather than its defense of the republicanism of the founders), have also made slavery the central theme of Southern history (for which a new states’ rights theory also had to be invented). What was new in the world was not the reality of slavery or its defense but the emergence of abolitionism. “The diversities of New World slavery should not blind us to the central point. In the 1760s there was nothing unprecedented about chattel slavery, even the slavery of one ethnic group to another. What was unprecedented by the 1760s and early 1770s was the emergence of a widespread conviction that New World slavery symbolized all the forces that threatened the true destiny of man.” A revolution in thought was needed to overcome a long “heritage of religious, legal, and philosophical tensions associated with slavery⎯or in other words, with the ways in which Western culture had organized man’s experience with lordship and bondage.” That revolution in thought was the Romanticism in Europe and in America.53

In 1962, Don E. Fehrenbacher had this to say about Lincoln and the Republican party.

The house-divided doctrine was essentially an effort to polarize public opinion; .and to elicit a clear-cut decision upon the most critical aspects of the slavery issue. Lincoln maintained that such a decision would terminate controversy and terminate it peaceably. He assumed, in other words, that the South would acquiesce in a Republican accession to power. But events proved that he had misread the Southern mind and seriously underestimated the threat of disunion. Yet it is unlikely that even a revelation of the future would have changed Lincoln’s thinking. Civil War was not, in his opinion, the worst disaster that could befall the American people. Behind his expectation that the South would submit to a verdict at the polls was a conviction that it must submit; for if majority rule, based on popular elections and bounded by constitutional restraints, could be set aside at the will of a dissatisfied minority, what remained of democratic government? Furthermore, Lincoln had constructed his political philosophy upon the belief that public policy should reflect an ethical purpose which was not itself subject to the daily barter of politics. ‘Important principles,’ he said, in the last speech of his life, ‘may, and must, be inflexible.’

What Prof. Feherenbacher could not admit, and many other historians after him cannot either, is that Lincoln’s principles were neither original nor native but imported from Europe. The many new “isms” of early national and antebellum America (Unitarianism, abolitionism, majoritarianism, Transcendentalism, and nationalism) were all expressions of Romantic perfectionism *Americanized*. As in Europe between 1815 and 1860 was a contest of ideas renewed here between the forces not of reaction and reform, but between eighteenth-century enlightened liberalism and nineteenth-century Romantic radicalism (inspired by German idealistic philosophy). Despite the Enlightenment, humankind still needed to be liberated from the past and tyranny or despotism anew (e. g., monarchy in Europe and slavery and the “Slave Power” in the South).54

Beyond Slavery/Notes
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 For these and other views by the author, see *Nullification, A Constitutional History, 1776-1833* (2 vols., Lanham, Maryland and Plymouth, UK: University Press of America, 2008, 2009) and related bibliography and historiography therein concerning eighteenth-century republican ideology and its persistence in the South (and other North), original versus different intentions, and Northern-Nationalist mythmaking in the nineteenth-century. These two volumes were based on the author’s Ph. D. dissertation, “The Union of the States: A Study of Radical Whig-Republican Ideology and its Influence upon the Nation and the South, 1776-1861” (University of South Carolina, 1978). See also <http://nullificationhistory.com>. The quote by Goldfield about Romanticism is from *America Aflame: How the Civil War Created A Nation (New York and London, 2011)*, 13. “In sum, the current emphasis on slavery as the cause of the Civil War is fraught with problems. It does not clarify the sequence of events, the divisions within the sections, or the policies and actions of the Republican Party.” (Marc Egnal, *Clash of Extremes: The Economic Origins of the Civil War* [New York, 2009], 7.) See also notes # 7, 11, and 40 below and Jeffrey Hummel, *Emancipating Slaves, Enslaving Free Men: A History of the American Civil War* (Chicago, 1996, 2013); Goldfield, *America Aflame*; Michael C. C. Adams, *Living Hell: The Dark Side of the Civil War* (Baltimore, 2014), and James M. McPherson, “Our Monstrous War,” *The New York Review of Books*, July 10, 2014, 69-70. Critical of new revisionism is Yael A. Stonehell, “Revisionism Reinvented? The Antiwar Turn in Civil War Scholarship,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era*, 3 (June 2013), 239-256. Adam L. Tate connects states’ rights less to slavery and more to a continuing defense of the Constitution and the federal and limited government that the founders established between 1776 and 1787-1788. (*Conservatism and Southern Intellectuals, 1789-1861* [Columbia, Missouri, 2005]. See also Marshall L. DeRosa, *The Confederate Constitution of 1861: An Inquiry into American Constitutionalism* (Columbia, Missouri, 1991). Supporting the author’s claim that Lincoln and the Republicans reinterpreted the Declaration of Independence to make it more egalitarian, democratic, antislavery, and nationalist than it was is Graham Alexander Peck, “Abraham Lincoln and the Triumph of an Antislavery Nationalism.” *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*, 28 (Summer 2007), 1-27, available at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/jala>. “Lincoln and the Republicans inverted northern ideas about antislavery politics by attaching a powerful nationalist ideology to the antislavery movement.” This “radical antislavery doctrine, inspired by the idea of equality” was “cloaked . . . in conservative garb.” (Ibid., page 2 of 20 of printed electronic format courtesy of the University of Michigan.) The myth of a “Slave Power” is addressed below in notes #15, 16, 30, 31, 33, 36, 46, and 49.

“Racial discrimination and segregation was much more pervasive in northern society than slavery. Blacks encountered segregated public schools, theaters, restaurants, stage coaches and railroad cars and churches. Even the Quakers, in Rhode Island and elsewhere, would not accept black members in meetings. African Americans could not vote in most northern states, and could vote but only in theory in most others. Nor could they elected or appointed to public office, serve in the state, militia, or intermarry with whites. (Prof. Michael Chesson, “Self-righteous Warriors,” ”American History News Network at <http://americanhistorynewsnetwork.org/racism-among-the-abolitionists>.) “The abolitionists were all too human. Blind to racism and the vestiges of slavery in their own back yards, they could focus with laser-like precision on the horrors of southern slavery a thousand miles away. White abolitionists were openly prejudiced against Irish immigrants and other Catholics in the antebellum era, but kept their own racism largely hidden, using epithets for blacks in private correspondence but not in their speeches and editorials.” (Ibid.) “When abolitionists were talking about the Constitution and big ideas about freedom and liberty, that’s abstract,” says R. Blakeslee Gilpin, a University of South Carolina history professor featured in ‘The Abolitionists” [PBS Documentary].” (See John Blake, ”What ‘Lincoln’ Misses and Another Civil War Film Gets Right,” January 8, 2013, CNN Entertainment, at www.cnn.com.) To Prof. Erica Armstrong Dunbar, “’The Abolitionists’ reveals that some of the most courageous anti-slavery activists were infected with the same white supremacist attitudes they crusaded against. White supremacy was so ingrained in early America that very few escaped its taint, even the most noble.” (Ibid.) “The majority of abolitionists did not believe in civic equality for blacks, Dunbar says. They believed the institution of slavery was immoral but questions about whether blacks were equal, let alone deserved the right to vote, were an entirely different subject.” (Prof. Dunbar quoted in ibid.) “Black and white abolitionists often had different agendas by the 1840s, and certainly in the 1850s. But one of the greatest frustrations that many black abolitionists faced was the racism they sometimes experienced from their fellow white abolitionists.” (Prof. David Blight, “David Blight on Racism in the Abolitionist Movement,” at <http://www.pbs.org/wgby.ala/part4> (Africans in America}. “Immediate abolition,” he [Garrison] argued, “does not mean that the slave shall immediately exercise the right of suffrage, or be eligible to any office.” (W. Caleb McDaniel, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery: Garrisonian Abolitionists & Transatlantic Reform* [Baton Rouge, 2013], 137.) “Especially in the West, Republicans insisted that they not the Democrats, were the real “white man’s party’.” “Most Republicans, however, were not prepared to insist on full legal equality, especially equality of political rights.” (“The Republicans and Race,” in Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* [Oxford, UK and New york, 1970, 1995], 261-300, quotes on 265, 291.)

Racism within the Republican party is further explored by Paul D. Escott in “*What Shall We Do with the Negro?”: Lincoln, White Racism, and Civil War America* (Charlottesville and London, 2009), 16-26, 29, 36-39, and 42-64. In the North, “College graduates had exploited these links [with trans-Atlantic slavery] for centuries. They apprenticed under the slave traders of New England, the mid-Atlantic, and Europe. They migrated to the South and to the West Indies for careers as teachers, ministers, lawyers, doctors, politicians, merchants, and planters. The end of the slave trade and decline of slavery in the North did not break these ties.” And “the antebellum South represented a field of opportunity . . . .” Craig Steven Wilder, *Ebony & Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America’s Universities* [New York and London, 2013], 2.)
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 See Wood, *Nullification, A Constitutional History* and “Locke, Jefferson, and the Declaration Reinterpreted: The Northern Origins of the Civil War, 1815-1865,” unpublished essay submitted to *Civil War History* in January, 2013 as a reply to Prof. Jeremy J. Tewell, “Assuring Freedom to the Free: Jefferson’s Declaration and the Conflict over Slavery,” *Civil War History*, 58 (March 2012), 75-96) available at http://nullificationhistory.com. Early American policies aimed at ameliorating slavery are presented most negatively by Larry E. Tise under the heading of the “Benevolent Empire” in *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1740 (*Athens, Georgia, 1987), 51-54, 214-215, 218, and 271-274. The views of Jefferson Davis on slavery in the territories, the Wilmot Proviso, Kansas, Lecompton, “abolitionism,” the threat posed by the Republican party and their refusal to compromise are elaborated at length in Cooper, *Jefferson Davis, American*, 170, 174, 192, 193, 275, 291-292 300-301, 309, 315, 318-320. “The truth was that much of the territory, any territory, that could be gained from Mexico would likely remain free, proviso or no. Too many emigrants from the free states, too few slaveholders, and a climate and soil uncertain for the gang cultivation of crops necessary for slave labor to be profitable.” (*America Aflame*, 50.) “The objections against the abolitionists were manifold. They disrupted the public order by calling for an end to an institution clearly protected by the Constitution.” (Ibid., 27; see also 67, 139-142.) “Neither the Constitution nor the Northwest Ordinance abolished slavery in the lands north of the Ohio River. The abolition of slavery in the area was to be decided by the individual states.” (Larry E. Tise, *Proslavery: A Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840* [Athens, Georgia, 1987], 55.) See also James Madison’s constitutional opposition to restriction of slavery in 1819-1820 in letters to Robert Walsh, November 27, 1819 and to James Monroe, February 10, 1820 in Rakove, ed., *Madison: Writings*, 737-745, 771-772.

“In a republic that lacked any uniform concept of citizenship, an interpretative consensus of the Constitution . . . and where liberty and slavery coexisted, perhaps the only clearly defined aspect was that states possessed the exclusive rights to regulate slavery within their jurisdiction.” Gary Gallagher, et al, eds., *Civil War: Fort Sumter to Appomattox* (Oxford, UK and New York, 2003, 2014), 13. For slavery, the Constitution, and states’ rights, see Keane, *The Life and Death of Democracy*, 314-315. “Without openly defending the institution, the slaveholding delegates made it very clear that control over slavery as it already existed was, to them, a matter for the exclusive jurisdiction of the states . . . .” (Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom’s Ferment: Phases of American Social History from the Colonial Period to the Outbreak of the Civil War* [Minneapolis, 1944; New York, 1962], 468.)

Michael Les Benedict falsely distinguishes between “state sovereignty” and “states’ rights” to lessen Lincoln’s admitted “nationalism” and actually make him a supporter of the latter (in the same way Alexander Hamilton did by referring to the states as mere administrative districts). To Benedict, moreover, “states’ rights” assumed sovereignty in the nation and as such rejected secession as well as nullification. See Benedict, “Abraham Lincoln and Federalism,” *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*,”10 (1988), 1-46. For a much different view, see Forrest McDonald, *States’ Rights in the Union: Imperium in Imperio* (Lawrence, Kansas, 2000) and review of same in *The American Journal of Legal History*, 44 (October 2000), 486-488. His understanding of “federalism” is at odds with its original meaning. The framers only divided the powers of government between delegated one (few and specific) for general or national purposes while reserving all the rest to the states. Sovereignty, however, remained with the people⎯of the states not in the aggregate. They made the government and they could undo it by an inherent right of revolution, which is what secession was in 1776 or 1861. The federal union of divided powers remained a voluntary compact. Benedict and others also dismiss much historical research about the federal and limited nature of the union of the states. The founders, he and others do not wish to acknowledge, were not democrats and were most wary of majority tyranny (precisely the government Lincoln embraced). See notes # 6 and 11 below and Wood, *Nullification, A Constitutional History*, I and II. Michael A. Morrison’s explanation for America’s Civil War is premised on James Madison’s belief that the experiment of an extended republic was founded on the fundamental antagonism of “liberty and equality” and “freedom and democracy” with the South and its allies representing “liberty and freedom” and the Republican North representing “equality and democracy.” (*Slavery and the American West*, 5, 8, and 12.)
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 John M. Daniel, *The Richmond Examiner*, August 14, 1861; John Keane, *The Life and Death of Democracy* (New York and London, 2009), 326. Keane in fact uses “compound republic” to describe the federal government of the founding era as a union of the states. See Ibid., 275-280, 328. “The story that American democracy was founded in the glory of 1776 is today still widely repeated by Americans, at public meetings, within school curricula, by journalists, and on government websites . . . . [T]he inspiring history of representative democracy in America is no simple tale of blissful progress. Politically speaking, its triumph was never guaranteed; it was always more fraught and fragile than the textbook story supposes. But the really odd thing about the glory of 1776 is its silence about a simple fact: that the republican gentlemen who championed the Philadelphia model of government, regardless of their political views on a wide range of issues, were not keen on democracy in any sense.” (Ibid., 275.) On the growing perception, North and South, that “two nations already existed” by 1850, see Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 172. In *The Shaping of American Liberalism: The Debates over Ratification, Nullification, and Slavery* (Chicago, 1993), David F. Ericson posits a conflict of ideas between republicanism and liberalism or pluralist democracy with the Civil War assuring the ascendancy of the latter. See also J. David Greenstone, *The Lincoln Persuasion: Remaking American Liberalism* (Princeton, 1994). “The scholarly consensus on slavery’s centrality to the causes of disunion has not mooted debates in the field . . . . Beneath a veneer of consensus lies considerable interpretive disagreement that should inform scholarly and public debate of the Civil War’s origins.” (Michael E. Woods, “What Twenty-First Century Historians Have Said About the Causes of Disunion: A Civil War Sesquicentennial Review of the Recent Literature,” *Journal of American History*, 99 [September 2012], 415-439 quote from http://www.journalofamericanhistory.org/1992/.
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 Wood, “Reply to Prof. Jeremy Tewell”; *Nullification, A Constitutional History*;

Don E. Fehrenbacher, *The Slaveholding Republic: An Account of the United States Government’s Relations to Slavery* (New York, 2002); and Fehrenbacher, *The Dred Scott Case: Its Significance in American Law and Politics* (New York, 1979). The new Republican emphasis upon the Declaration of Independence is described in Fehrenbacher, *The Slaveholding Republic*, 279-281 and Lincoln’s reaction to Kansas-Nebraska and Douglas’s interpretation of 1776 on 286-290. See also David Donald, *Lincoln* (New York and London, 1995), 200-202, 206-209; Foner, *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery* (New York, 2010), 67-69; and Graham A. Peck, “Abraham Lincoln and the Triumph of an Antislavery Nationalism,” *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*, 28 (Summer 2007), 1-27. James M. McPherson had to admit, however, that “The historical basis of Lincoln’s argument . . . had some holes in it” that Douglas exploited!! (*Battle Cry of Freedom*, 129.) For the mythology of the Northwest Ordinance, see Fehrenbacher, *The Slaveholding Republic*, 255. On the improbability of slavery’s establishment because a territorial government could effectively prevent it, as reiterated by Stephen A. Douglas, see *The Slaveholding Republic*, 287-288.

 Charles Ramsdell was right about “The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XVI (September 1929), 151-171 for the wrong reasons. Being a revisionist, he believed in a repressible conflict that rejected any fundamental North-South differences constitutionally or philosophically (states’ rights, that he also opposed, was the Southern response to radical abolitionism and the exaggerated threat of slavery’s expansion). Rejecting “Natural Limits” are Harry V. Jaffa, *Crisis of the House Divided: An Interpretation of the Issues in the Lincoln-Douglas Debates* (Chicago, 1959, 2009), Eugene H. Berwanger, *The Frontier Against Slavery: Western Anti-Negro Prejudice and the Slavery Extension Controversy* (Urbana, 1976, 2002), and Leonard L. Richards in *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1780-1860* (Baton Rouge, 2000) and *The California Gold Rush and the Coming of the Civil War* (New York, 2007). Slave labor, they suggest, could easily be adapted to other non-agricultural enterprises such as gold mining in California. According to the 1860 census, however, California had no slaves and 4,000 free blacks. Besides, it had already been admitted as a free state in 1850. In California and other western territories, opposition to slavery emanated from a common racist motive and a selfish one (not having wages depressed). Jaffa is wrong about the lack of any contemporary evidence of a belief in “Natural Limits.” See the debates in Congress about the admission of Missouri and resulting compromise with slavery being restricted and other examples in the “Southern Editorials Project” of Furman University at <http://history.furman.edu/editorials> particularly about the Nebraska bill of 1854. He and other deniers overlook Lincoln’s and the Republican party’s own acceptance of “Natural Limits.” To them, it was irrelevant to their central moral point of slavery being a wrong and that slavery and freedom could no longer co-exist as it had since the founding of the American republic.

 On the reality of “Natural Limits” in the Missouri debates of 1819-1821, see most recently Matthew Mason, *Slavery & Politics in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill, 2006), 25, 148-150, 154, 181-187. It “was a necessity in the Deep South” that also made the South amenable to “slavery’s restriction above the Ohio River” but allowing it “to spread to the Southwest.” The Ohio River was “a firm boundary between freedom and slavery.” Mason uses the terms “doctrine of spheres” and “doctrine of separate spheres.” Rep. James Tallmadge refers to the necessity of slavery in the South by geography and climate in *Annals of Congress*, 15th Cong., 2nd session, Feb. 15, 1819, col. 1210. Mr. Taylor of New York provides an interesting twist by his argument in favor of public opinion acting as a barrier to the spread of slavery (i.e., the moral effect produced by the history and memory of the old Northwest Ordinance of 1787). (Ibid., col. 1179.)

 “Natural limits” after the Missouri Compromise is also emphasized by Fehrenbacher, *The Slaveholding Republic*, 255, 270-275, See also Fehrenbacher, *Prelude to Greatness: Lincoln in the 1850’s* (Stanford, California, 1962), 22 (calling it “an unverifiable assertion”). Fehrenbacher also notes the reality and influence of public opinion in preventing the spread of slavery. “Most westward-moving Americans were Northerners loyal to northern institutions and northern culture, and likely to restrict the introduction of slave agriculture.” (*The Slaveholding Republic*, 275.). See also Fehrenbacher, *The Dred Scott Decision*, 176, 192-193 (on Utah and New Mexico); William Lee Miller, *Arguing About Slavery: The Great Debate in the United States Congress* (New York, 1996), 15, 17; and Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 50.

 “Slavery does not exist in the territory of Oregon. I do not know that a slave ever did make, or ever will make, a foot-print on its soil.” (Armistead Burt of S. C., “Territorial Government of Oregon,” in *Congressional Globe*, 29th Cong., 2nd session, Jan. 14, 1847, 116-119 (quote on 116). See also the *Detroit Free Press*, January 15 and 27, 1854 in Nineteenth Century Documents Project/Secession Era Editorials at <http://furman.edu-benson/docs>. Lincoln acknowledged “Natural Limits” but dismissed it as irrelevant to the moral issue of slavery being a wrong!! See “Speech at Cincinnati, Ohio,” September 17, 1859, 59-89 (quote on 64-66) in *Lincoln: Speeches and Writings*, edited by Don E. Fehrenbacher (New York, 1989). But also see Larry Gara, “Slavery and Slave Power: A Crucial Distinction,” *Civil War History*, 15 (March 1969), 5-18.
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Wood, “Reply to Prof. Jeremy Tewell” and *Nullification, A Constitutional History*. Antebellum Southerners and Confederates always insisted that they were the true defenders of the republican-federalist beliefs of the founders of the republic. Besides works by the author cited above, see also James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York, 1988) and McPherson, *For Cause and Comrades: Why Men Fought in the Civil War* (New York, 1997). A still valuable study of the Lost Cause is Richard Weaver, *The Southern Tradition at Bay* (New Rochelle, N. Y., 1968). On Douglas and popular sovereignty, see Christopher Childers, *The Failure of Popular Sovereignty: Slavery, Manifest Destiny, and the Radicalization of Southern Politics* (Lawrence, Kansas, 2012) and Martin H. Quitt, *Stephen A. Douglas and Antebellum Democracy* (New York, 2012). For secession as legitimate exercise of a right of revolution and the Northern abolitionist-Republic corruption of both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, see William J. Cooper, Jr., *Jefferson Davis, American* (New York, 2000), 7.

To James Madison, there was no Congressional power over internal “migration or removal of individuals whether freemen or slaves, from one State to another, whether new or old.” There was no authority either to “attach conditions” to the admission of new states. Also, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 became a dead letter with the new Constitution as amended of 1787-1788. “Every indication is against such a construction by Congress of their constitutional powers. Their alacrity in exercising their powers relating to slaves, is a proof that they did not claim what they did not exercise.” See James Madison to Robert Walsh, November 27, 1819 in Jack N. Rakove, ed., *Madison: Writings* [New York, 1999], 737-745 quotes on 739, 741. “On the whole, the Missouri question, as a constitutional one, amounts to the question whether the condition proposed would not be void in itself, or become void the moment the territory should enter as a State within the pale of the Constitution.” As for the issue of Missouri, it was as much a “fire-bell in the night” to Madison as James Monroe and John C. Calhoun as it was to Jefferson and other Southerners. The “tendency of what has passed and is passing, fills me with no slight anxiety.” (Ibid., 744.) See also Madison to James Monroe, February 10, 1820 in ibid., 771-772; Stuart Leibiger, ed., *A Companion to James Madison and James Monroe* (Malden, Massachusetts, 2013), and review of same by Dinah Mayo-Bobee, East Tennessee State University, in *Journal of Southern History*, LXXX (May 2014), 457-459.
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 See “The Lost Cause and the Myth of Democracy,” in “The Union of the States, 697-724”; *Nullification, A Constitutional History*; and additional works by the author cited below in note #11 and Confederate history in notes #7 and #40. See also William J. Cooper, Jr., *Liberty and Slavery: Southern Politics to 1860* (New York, 1983, Columbia, S. C., 2000), 267. Most valuable too is John Phillip Reid, *Constitutional History of the American Revolution* (4 vols., Madison, Wisconsin, 1986-1995, 2003). For a right of revolution, see Reid, *Constitutional History of the American Revolution* (abridged edition, Madison, Wisconsin, 1995), 101-102. On state sovereignty as an American principle of government inseparable from federalism and unrelated to the issue of slavery, see Aaron N. Coleman, “Debating the Nature of State Sovereignty: Nationalists, State Sovereignists, and the Treaty of Paris (1783),” *The Journal of The Historical Society,* 13 (September 2012), 309-340. The nature of the British Empire is discussed in “Rethinking Mercantilism,” a forum, *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 69 (January 2012), 3-70. The origins of American federalism in the imperial-colonial relationship and sovereignty indivisible versus *imperium in imperio*, see Reid, *Constitutional History of the American Revolution*, 75-78, 101 and Thomas P. Slaughter*, Independence: the Tangled Roots of the American Revolution* (New York, 2014), xv-xix, 47-54, 152, 217-227, and 386-387. See also John Craig Hammond, “Slavery, Sovereignty, and Empires: North American Borderlands and the American Civil War, 1660-1860,” *Journal of the Civil War Era*, 4 (June 2014), 264-298. For the colonial attempt “to define for their own protection the limits of empire . . . by an appeal to the rights of Englishmen and to the English constitution,” see David S. Lovejoy, “Two American Revolutions, 1689 and 1776, “ in J. G. A. Pocock, ed., *Three British Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776* (Princeton, 1980), 244-262. Parliament’s increasing appeal to sovereignty indivisible is detailed in Pocock, “1776: The Revolution Against Parliament” and Alison Gilbert Olson, “Parliament, Empire, and Parliamentary Law, 1776” in ibid., 265-288 and 289-322. The name, Confederate States of America, suggests no more than the idea of America’s government being a compound, confederate republic as described by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison in *The Federalist* and in the works of John Taylor of Caroline. See notes # 8 and 12 below.

“He [Lincoln] curtly rejected partition of the nation as an ultimate arrangement, not because it seemed utterly improbable, but because it was impermissible.” To Lincoln, “Republicanism . . .embraced a belief (that slavery was wrong), a program of action (federal legislation preventing its extension), and an ultimate objective of hope (complete extinction of the institution at some distant date and by some peaceful means not yet discovered).” (Fehrenbacher, *Prelude to Greatness*: *Lincoln in the 1850s* [Stanford, Calif., 1962], 75, 77.) On Lincoln’s rejection of secession, see Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 195-197, 199-200. Lincoln may have denied secession based on his new view of the Union as older than the states, and dismissed the “magical omnipotence of ‘State rights,” asserting a claim of power to lawfully destroy the Union itself,” but history again proves him wrong. For this author, James Madison is a far superior authority who described the federal republic as a union of the states based on a voluntary compact. See his early writings from 1787 to 1830 in Rakove, ed, *Madison: Writings*, 89-663 and Constitution as a compact, 589, 609-614, 778, 800, 843, 848, 850, 858, and 862.). In his “First Inaugural Address,” March 4, 1861, Lincoln self-assuredly asserted “that no government proper [national], ever had a provision in its organic law for its termination,” when in fact the American republic had. (See Fehrenbacher, ed., *Lincoln: Speeches and Writings*, 215-224 quotes on 217.)
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 Wood, “The Lost Cause and the Myth of Democracy,” in “The Union of the States”; *Nullification, A Constitutional History*, and additional works cited in notes #10 and #40 below. See also Edward Pollard, *Southern History of the War* (2 vols., New York, 1866); Alexander H. Stephens, *A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States*. . .(2 vols., Philadelphia, 1870); Richard Taylor, *Destruction and Reconstruction* [New York, 1879; Bernard J. Sage, "Some Great Constitutional Questions," *Southern Historical Papers*, XII (Jan.-Dec., 1884), 485-499; Judge J. A. P. Campbell, "The Lost Cause," ibid., XVI (1888), 237-243; Chief Justice Peter Turney [of Tennessee], "They Wore the Gray: The Southern Cause Vindicated," ibid., XVI (1888), 319-339; General E. M. Law, "The Confederate Revolution, ibid., XVII (1889), 85-111; Gen. Joseph Wheeler, "Causes of the War," ibid., XXII (1894), 24-41; Julian L. Well, "Causes of the War, 1861-1865," ibid., XXXII (1904), 13-32; Dunbar Rowland, ed., Jefferson Davis, *Constitutionalist: His Letters, Papers and Speeches* (Jackson, Mississippi, 1923); and Dwight L. Dumond, ed., *Southern Editorials on Secession* (New York, 1931).

 Jabez L. M. Curry, *The Constitutional Rights of the States* (1860); Curry, *An Address on Slavery, Nullification, Secession .* . . (1896); and Curry, *Principles, Acts, and Utterances of John C. Calhoun*. . . (1898), all in the J. L. M. Curry Pamphlet Collection, Alabama Department of History and Archives (ADAH). See also in ibid., *The Causes of the Civil War; The Confederate Cause and its Defenders; Revolution and Reconstruction; Secession Considered as a Right in the States; and Equality and Democracy*. See further the John W. Dubose Correspondence, Alabama Department of Archives and History (ADAH); Martin Van Buren Moore, "The Rebel's Requiem" and "Boast or Prophecy, or the Strength of the Confederate Army" (mss., 67 pages) in the Moore Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. To Moore, "The Confederate soldier fought because he believed he was in the Right" and that he was "in a struggle for human liberty⎯or the constitutional liberty of our forefathers." Moreover, "the masses of Southern soldiers did not consider they were in rebellion against the Union: their acts were directed, as they believed, against the sectionalism of the abolition-Republican party, which . . . had accidently obtained control of the government, by a minority vote. . . ." ("Boast or Prophecy," 4.) See also Walter Montgomery, "Civil History of the Confederacy" (Montgomery Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill); J. Minerva Abercrombie to Son, May 28, 1862 (Letter, ADAH); Thomas M. Owen, draft resolution for the Alabama Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (Thomas M. Owen Papers, Box 4, ADAH).

 For republicanism persisting in the South and the Democratic North after 1865, to inform opposition to Republican Reconstruction, see Andrew Heath, “’Let the Empire Come”: Imperialism and its Critics in the Reconstruction South,” *Civil War History*, 60 (June 2014), 152-189. To Henry Adams, the Democrats were “the last remnants of the eighteenth century.” Quoted in Morton Keller, *America’s Three Regimes: A New Political History* (Oxford, UK and New York, 2007), 149. For Democratic-Republican differences beyond the “bloody shirt,” see ibid., 145-150. See also R. Hal Williams, *Realigning America: McKinley, Bryan, and the Remarkable Election of 1896* (Lawrence, Kansas, 2010). “Democrats believed in states’ rights, decentralization, and limited government.” They “enjoyed winning elections to keep activist-minded Republicans from power.” (Ibid., 10.) Between 1876-1892, “elections were close, the closest the country has experienced” with “an average differential of only 1.4 percent” separating respective Republican-Democratic candidates for president. (Ibid., 8.) In general, see chapter one, “1896: The Party Background,” 1-19 and chapter two, “The Democrats in Power, 1893-1896,” 21-49. The “Southern Democratic Party continued as the ‘party of the [founding] fathers.” Quoted in Alan Trachtenberg, *The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age (*New York, 1982, 2007), 170. On the emergence of a Northern Democratic critique of Republican policy, see ibid., 165-173 and Heather Cox Richardson, *The Death of Reconstruction: Race, Labor, and Politics in the Post-Civil War North, 18651901* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2001), 57-77. See also John M. Pafford, *The Forgotten Conservative: Rediscovering Grover Cleveland* (Washington, D. C., 2013). Paul D. Escott’s *What Shall We Do With the Negro?: Lincoln White Racism, and Civil War America* (Charlottesville and London, 2009) is informative about the lack of Republican commitment to racial equality after 1865.

 Beyond continuing party differences about the tariff, currency, and internal improvements, the relationship between “Capital and Labor” became a predominant issue with the expansion of a new American working class and its radicalization by revolutionary ideas from Europe. Reviving horrors of the Jacobins and their “Reign of Terror” in 1792-1794 and the barricades of 1848, the Paris Commune of 1871 actively embraced egalitarianism as socialism and communism to wage war against the capitalists. See Trachtenberg, *The Incorporation of America*, chapter three, “Capital and Labor,” 70-100 and Richardson, *The Death of Reconstruction*, 85-86.

After 1870, for many reasons, Republicans “abandoned Southern blacks” and “turned their attention to growing the Northern economy. See K. Stephen Prince, “Legitimacy and Intervention: Northern Republicans, the ‘Terrible Carpetbagger,’ and the Retreat from Reconstruction,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era*, 2 (December 2012), 536-563; Marc Egnal, *Clash of Exttremes*, 326-348 (quotes on 341, 342); Richardson, *The Death of Reconstruction*; David Montgomery, *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans, 1862-1872* (Urbana, 1967, 1981), especially Chap. 2, “Democrats, Conservatives, and Radicals,” 45-72; Charles C. Calhoun, *Conceiving a New Republic: The Republican Party and the Southern Question, 1869-1900* (Lawrence, Kansas, 2006); Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 478-505 (along with the rise of the Democratic party); and Edward J. Blum, *Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion, and American Nationalism, 1865-1898* (Baton Rouge, 2007). Despite the title, imperialism was the larger unifying idea. See especially *The Old Guard* (1863-1867), a magazine edited by Chauncey S. Burr, at the Making of America Digital Archive, Cornell University. On the limits of national citizenship being “hardly incompatible with exclusion based on either race or gender,” see Carole Emberton, “’Only Murder Makes Men’: Reconsidering the Black Military Experience,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era,* 2 (September 2012), 369-393 quote on 387. For reunion and reconciliation without reconstruction, see Joan Waugh, “’I Only Knew What Was in My Mind’: Ulysses S. Grant and the Meaning of Appomattox,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era*, 2 (September 2012), 307-336 and Gary W. Gallagher, “The Civil War at the Sesquicentennial: How Well Do Americans Understand Their Great National Crisis?,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era*, 3 (June 2013), 295-303.
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Wood, “The Union of the States”; *Nullification, A Constitutional History*; and “Reply to Prof. Jeremy J. Tewell.” On Lincoln and the secession crisis, see further Goldfield, *America Aflame*, “Chap. 8, The Tug Comes,” 180-204. “But popular support for secession was not yet broad or strong enough in 1850 to carry out such threats [of secession and disunion], and some influential lower South leaders fought energetically against leaving the Union.” (Bruce Levine, *The Fall of the House of Dixie: The Civil War and the Social Revolution That Transformed the South* [New York, 2014], 35.) See also Eric H. Walther, “The Fire-Eaters and ~~Seward~~ Lincoln,” *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Association*, 32 (Winter 2011), 18-32. By 1852, “cooperationists won the debate in South Carolina and thus ended the hope of disunion for a while.” (Ibid., 21.) “We see a political party presenting candidates for the Presidency and the Vice-Presidency, selected for the first time from the Free States alone, with the avowed purpose of electing these candidates by suffrages from one part of the Union only, to rule over the whole United States. Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected on the consequences which must inevitably follow in case of success? Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our Southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate?” (Millard Fillmore on the new Republican party quoted in John E. E. Dalberg (Lord Acton), “The Civil War in America: Its Place in History,” in *Historical Essays and Studies*, ed. by John N. Figgis and Reginald V. Laurence (London, 1907), 124-143 quote on 139-140 (available at the Online Library of Liberty at <http://oll.libertyfund.org>). On calculating the value of the union, see remarks by James Jackson of Georgia and Thomas Tudor Tucker of South Carolina in Congress, 1790, and John Taylor of Caroline in 1813 quoted by Tyler, *Freedom’s Ferment*, 469, 473-474.

 North and South “were intensely aware of the Revolutionary legacy.” “Both sides claimed the Revolutionary mantle and filial responsibility to emulate and protect it.” (Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 4, 207.)

For the federal nature of America’s republican government, and states’ rights being integral to federalism and limited government and a beneficial sectional economic diversity, see John Taylor *An Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Constitution of the United States* (Fredericksburg, Virginia, 1814; Memphis, Tennessee, 2012); Taylor, *New Views of the Constitution of the United States* (Washington, D. C., 1823; Clark, New Jersey, 2002, 2010); and Taylor, *Tyranny Unmasked* (Washington, D. C., 1822, Indianapolis, 1992). John Taylor of Caroline’s books are also available online at The Constitution Society, [www.constitution.org](http://www.constitution.org). Taylor’s views, however, were but repetitions of views expressed much earlier by James Madison. “See “Charters,” “Government of the United States,” and “Who Are the Best Keepers of the People’s Liberties? [on “republican” versus “anti-republican”],” 1792-1793 in Rakove, ed., *Madison Writings*, 502-504, 508-509, 532-534.
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 Brian R. Dirck, *Lincoln and the Constitution* (Carbondale, Illinois, 2012), 33; Russell McClintock, *Lincoln and the Decision for Wa*r: *The Northern Response to Secession (*Chapel Hill, N. C., 2008); William J. Cooper, Jr., *We Have War Upon Us: The Onset of the Civil War, November 1860-April* 1861 (New York, 2013); and Goldfield, *America Aflame*, chap. 8, “The Tug Comes,” 180-204. “Unionists in the Upper South typically made it clear that they would remain loyal only as long as the incoming Lincoln administration guaranteed the safety of slavery in states where it already existed and, more ominously, employed no coercion against the seceded states. The question of coercion came into focus on Fort Sumter . . . . Lincoln sought to place responsibility for the start of hostilities on Jefferson Davis and the Confederates.” (Gallagher, et al, eds., *Civil War: Fort Sumter to Appomattox*, 32.) “By the spring of 1861, Abraham Lincoln had concluded that lower-south secession leaders were beyond either persuading or pressuring into peacefully accepting Republican rule. That fact, he believed, left him with but two choices⎯either to accept the Union’s breakup as a permanent reality or to oppose secession firmly even at the risk of war. He chose the second course,. He would risk war rather than passively accept the Union’s destruction.” (Levine, *The Fall of the House of Dixie*, 47-48.) “Lincoln therefore decided to supply Fort Sumter with provisions but no troops. He then conveyed that decision to South Carolina’s governor. By sending supplies, he would reassert the Union’s authority and integrity. By sending *only* supplies, he gave secession’s leaders a reason not to attack. To put it another way, he would give the Confederates no obvious *excuse* to attack. Lincoln was not going to surrender Sumter, but he was not going to allow Jefferson Davis to place upon Union shoulders the onus for starting the war. If Davis wanted that war, he would have to take responsibility for starting it.” (Levine, *The Fall of the House of Dixie*, 48-49.)

“When he maneuvered Confederate president Jefferson Davis into foolishly firing the first shot . . . .” (Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 8.). “When he called for northern volunteers to put down the rebellion, four additional states seceded and the war began.” (Ibid., 8.) “Lincoln greeted the news from Sumter almost with a sense of relief. The Confederacy had fired the first shot. ‘They attacked Sumter. It fell and thus did more service than it otherwise would. (*America Aflame,* 203.) The Confederate viewpoint on Fort Sumter and the first shots are presented in Cooper, *Jefferson Davis, American*, 321, 337-342.

The progress of arms would determine “the fate of slavery; the definition of freedom; the destruction of the Old South’s socio-economic system and the triumph of entrepreneurial free labor as the national norm; a new definition of American nationalism; the origins of a new system of race relations.” (James M. McPherson, *Tried by Fire: Abraham Lincoln as Commander in Chief* [New York, 2008], xiv.) On emancipation and military abolitionism, see Martha S. Jones, “History and Commemoration: The Emancipation Proclamation at 150,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era,* 3 (December 2013), 452-458 and James Oakes, “Reluctant to Emancipate? Another Look at the First Confiscation Act,” ibid., 458-466.

“Lincoln’s argument [at Cooper Union] was a masterpiece of misdirection. He ostensibly argued for a conservative antislavery extension policy that comported with the will of the founders, yet in fact he issued a radical manifesto against slavery that denounced disunionism and importuned Republicans to resist it at any cost. Lincoln achieved this startling result with means as covertly radical as his ends.” “This carefully researched contention [that Congress possessed the power to prohibit slavery in the nation’s territories] was straightforward, but in a masterful sleight of hand Lincoln inferred from it that the founders intended to put slavery in the course of ultimate extinction, a conclusion that did not follow from the premises.” “The founders’ thinking on slavery was considerably more complex than Lincoln acknowledged . . . .In stark contrast to the Constitution’s authors, the Republicans deliberately sought to annihilate slavery⎯and hence risked destruction of the Union⎯because they feared slavery’s vitality and expected it to expand. Their assumptions and intentions therefore differed radically from those of the founders. Consequently, Lincoln’s claim that Republican antislavery policy descended directly from the founders flowed from a distinctly selective reading of the nation’s past.” (Peck, “Abraham Lincoln and the Triumph of Antislavery Nationalism,” page 10 of 20 of printed electronic version from umich.edu.)
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11
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Dirck, *Lincoln and the Constitution*, 31-32, 107. See also Garry Wills, *Lincoln at Gettysburg: The Words That Remade America* (New York, 1992) and Pauline Maier, *American Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence* (New York, 1997). “Although many delegates were hostile to slavery, no one proposed outright abolition under the new government.” “When the clause [abolishing the slave trade] was written into the Constitution, many thought it would lead to the eventual end of slavery.” Also, comity for slaveowners was “freely given” because there were slaveowners in the North. (Paul Finkelman, *An Imperfect Union: Slavery, Federalism, and Comity* [Chapel Hill, 1981], 23, 25, 179.) Lincoln may have been many things to many people, but he was most certainly not a historian. He was absolutely wrong about 1776 being about equality beyond mere independence as were the abolitionists before him. Liberty defined less expansively in an eighteenth-century context was not as paradoxical with respect to slavery as it later became. See notes #37-40 below and “A Declaration of Independence Not Equality: Historians Tell the Truth About 1776” at [www.nullificationhistory.com](http://www.nullificationhistory.com). And the government created in 1787-1788 was not “national.” At the same time, Lincoln conveniently ignores his hero Jefferson’s consistent federalist-states’ rights views from 1787-1826 not to mention “The Sage of Monticello’s” admission that in writing the Declaration he was summarizing old ideas not expressing new ones. See Alexander Hamilton’s description of America’s proposed government to be in 1787 as a “confederate republic” and federal rather than national in the “*The Federalist* No. 9” quoted above, betrays Lincoln’s assertion to the contrary. So, too, does James Madison’s use of the same term and his repeated view of the proposed plan of government as partly “federal and partly national. See “*The Federalist* Nos. 10, 39-46, and 62” in Scigliano, ed., *The Federalist*, 53-61 and 239-307. See also Madison’s distinction between a democracy and a republic in *The Federalist* No. 10,” 60-61 and # 39, 239-242; the danger of majority tyranny in #10, 57, and his definition of a national versus a federal government in #39, 244-246. Besides “confederate republic,” Madison refers to “so compound a system” (#82, 525; “the plan of the Federal Constitution” (#38, 235; and “a limited Constitution” (#78, 497 and #81, 516). In #40, Madison states: “The truth is, that the great principles of the Constitution proposed by the convention may be considered less as absolutely new, than as the expansion of principles which are found in the articles of Confedeation.” (#40, 251.) These quotes alone are proof enough to cast doubt on Michael Les Benedict’s analysis in “Abraham Lincoln and Federalism,” *Journal of the Abraham Lincoln Associatio*n, 10 (1988), 1-46. The missing link between republicanism, federalism, and states’ rights is explored in Wood, *Nullification, A Constitutional History,* I and II. See notes #2, 6, and 8 above and also John M. Murrin, “A Roof without Walls: The Dilemma of American National Identity” and Richard E. Ellis, “The Persistence of Antifederalism after 1789” in Richard Beeman, et al, eds., *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity* (Chapel Hill, 1987), 295-314 and 333-348. See especially Frederick D. Drake and Lynn R. Nelson, eds., *States’ Rights and American Federalism: A Documentary History* (Westport, Connecticut, 1999).

“Colonial whigs would fight the Revolution not only against the British Parliament but on behalf of the British constitution. That constitution, as they interpreted it, defended customary, prescriptive, contractarian rights against the onslaught of government’s assertion of arbitrary power.” (John Phillip Reid, *Constitutional History of the American Revolutionary Revolution* [Abridged edition, Madison, Wisconsin, 1995 ix-x] “Writers of the generation that took part in the Revolution or personally knew its participants largely described it as a struggle about constitutional government. Later, through much of the nineteenth century, the ‘whig,’ or ‘nationalist,’ school reigned supreme. The Nationalists oversimplified the Revolution by employing the standard stereotype of a patriotic struggle between liberty and tyranny as a common denominator explaining complex issues and events of those gravid times.” (Ibid., x.) “Early historians rewrote the past to make the Constitution the culminating event of their story.” (John M. Murrin, “A Roof without Walls,” 347.)
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“Lincoln and the Republicans inverted northern ideas about antislavery politics by attaching a powerful nationalist ideology to the antislavery movement. Their core proposition⎯that the nation was dedicated to freedom⎯resonated deeply in the free states. Adopting that doctrine, Republicans insisted that Congress possessed the power and the duty to exclude slavery from the territories . . . . This was radical antislavery doctrine, inspired by the idea of equality, justified by antislavery legal theory, and animated by a desire to destroy slavery. Yet, as Lincoln’s speeches demonstrate, especially well, the Republicans cloaked this doctrine in conservative garb.” (Peck, “Abraham Lincoln and the Triumph of Antislavery Nationalism,” page 2 of 20 of printed electronic version from umich.edu.) Lincoln not only “offered a negative critique of secession as a political and practical act,” but he countered with the argument that “the national community, ,the Union, was good. In doing so, he introduced what would become the bedrock feature of his wartime constitutionalism: Lincoln’s unshakeable, core belief in a permanent, inviolate national community.” (Dirck, *Lincoln and the Constitution*,” 62.) This, of course, was not the union of the states but the states united and “consolidation” that had been warned about since the Federal Convention.
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36

 Dirck, *Lincoln and the Constitution*, 49; Alexander H. Stephens quoted in Wills, *Lincoln at Gettysburg*, 125; see also Edmund Wilson, “The Union as Religious Mysticism,” in *Patriotic Gore: Studies in the Literature of the American Civil War* (New York, 1962, 1992), 59-98. “I do not wish to have the slave emancipated because I love him, but because I hate his master.” (Mr. Chase of Ohio quoted in Lord Acton, “The Civil War in America: Its Place in History,” in *Historical Essays and Studies*, 140. “The notion of a historically grounded, almost mystical American nation was the key difference between Lincoln’s constitutionalism and that of the Confederacy.” (Dirck, *Lincoln and the Constitution*, 63.)
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 “How Revolutionary Was the American Revolution? A Discussion of Gordon S. Wood’s *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, LI (October 1994), 679-716 quote on 707; William Raspberry, “Declaration of Independence Was Not Written With All Americans in Mind,” *Montgomery Advertiser*, July 4, 1997; Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*  (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967), 283; David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution , 1770-1823* (Oxford and New York, 1999), 261.
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Jack N. Rakove,, review of *Liberty and Equality*, *The New Republic*, August 9, 2012 at <http://www.newrepublic.com>. The egalitarian message of the Declaration with a collectivist spin is presented in Danielle Allen, *Our Declaration*: *A Reading of the Declaration of Independence in Defense of Equality* (New York, 2014). See review by Gordon S. Wood, “A Different Idea of Our Declaration,” *New York Review of Books*, August 14, 2014, 37-38 and publisher summary at <http://books.wwnorton.com>.
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 Pauline Maier, *American Scripture*, 192. Equally important in restoring the original intentions of the founders of 1776 is Jack P. Greene, “All Men Are Created Equal,” in *Imperatives, Behaviors, and Identities: Essays in Early American Cultural History* (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1992), 236-265. See also Greene, *The Intellectual Construction of America* (Chapel Hill, 1993).
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 Michael Kammen, *Sovereignty and Liberty: Constitutional Discourse in American Culture* (Madison, 1988), 56; Duncan MacLeod, *Slavery, Race, and the American Revolution* (Cambridge, UK and New York, 1974), 94; Robert McColley, *Slavery in Jeffersonian Virginia* (Urbana, 1968), 121; Tise, Proslavery: *A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840* (Athens, Georgia, 1987), 4, 10. See also chap. One, “Beyond Racism and the ‘Positive Good’ Argument, 3-11. As for the Civil War, it was exactly what Southerners said it was in their Lost Cause: an inevitable conflict between fundamentally different societies with constitutional issues being in the forefront. It was, in fact, not so much a contest between North and South as between the 18th and 19th centuries. While slavery was certainly important, it was also the symbol of all the differences between North and South. "The disruption of the Union, in 1861," declared Edward Pollard in 1866, "was by no means the direct or the logical consequence of the slavery discussion. The dispute on that subject had at least narrowed down to a solitary point⎯whether it was competent for Congress . . . directly or indirectly, to exclude slavery from the territories of the union . . . ." (Edward Pollard, *Southern History of the War* (2 vols., New York, 1866), II, 580.) In his view, moreover, "The terrible war which ensued on Disunion must be taken as the result of a profound and long continued conflict between the political and social systems of North and South." (Ibid., 581.) To Alexander H. Stephens, "The Southern States were ever loyal and true to the Constitution." (Alexander H. Stephens, *A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States* . . .[2 vols., Philadelphia, 1870], II, 50) "The common belief that slavery was the cause of the civil war is incorrect." (Richard Taylor, *Destruction and Reconstruction* [New York, 1879] quoted in Richard Weaver, *The Southern Tradition at Bay* [New Rochelle, N.Y., 1964], 191).
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 Tise*, Proslavery*, xiv, 221. “The great proslavery revolution that occurred in America during the 1830s was not the development of new proslavery arguments. It was instead the general shift of Americans to a new perspective of their own society that could tolerate the perpetuation of slavery. The real revolution was a national rejection of the libertarian heritage of the American Revolution.” (Ibid., 262.) If Prof. Tise misinterprets the Declaration along with the American Revolution in general, he also reverses the real history of the Middle Period. It was the North (symbolized by the abolitionists and the new Republican party) that changed and not the South (and its Northern allies). Agreeing with the author’s research and views expressed since 1978 is John M. Murrin. Using the Court versus the Country political terminology from England, and applying it to the new American Republic after 1776, Murrin observes: “But at another level the vital difference between Britain and America was not so much the voting population or even ethnic and religious pluralism, but the South. From this perspective, Country principles [Whig-opposition ideology that became Americanized as republicanism] did become inseparable from American politics after the titanic battles of the 1790s, not because everybody shared them, but because they overwhelmingly characterized a region that established something close to political hegemony within the republic after 1801. Had the Union begun and ended north of the Potomac, Federalists probably could have created a variant of Britain in America, with themselves as a genuine ruling class presiding over a modernizing economy. And America politics would then have acquired a more overt class basis. But slaveholding planters by dominating the federal government without serious interruption from 1801 to 1861, made regional Country principles into national political practices until the party of Lincoln emerged to threaten everything they cherished. In response they tried to withdraw into a smaller union that could sustain their system, but were smashed into submission by invading armies from the industrial North. Even then, whenever the South remained free to function openly in national politics, it severely limited Northern options. A united south could still tip the balance in national politics, it severely limited Northern options.” (“The Great Inversion, Or, Court Versus Country: A Comparison of the Revolution Settlements in England [1688-1721] and America (1776-1816],” in Pocock, ed., *Three British Revolutions: 1641, 1688, and 1776*, 368-451, quote on 426.)

 The notion of a “conservative counterrevolution” against 1776 serves another purpose for Tise and that is to absolve the abolitionists and later the Republicans of the charge that they were “fanatics” and “Jacobins” of old conspiring “against American republicanism” by employing the tactics of French revolutionaries to spread infidelity and anarchy” and to promote the equalization of the races.” The real “crisis mongers,” in his view, were Southerners and their Northern allies. By no means alone, Tise cannot accept “the perception of abolition as a radical un-American movement.” Nor is he willing to admit any other than an egalitarian “heritage of the American Revolution.” (Tise, *Proslavery*, 186, 188, 190.) Slavery’s defenders “could never escape the judgment that the institution did not square with the equalitarian ideals and republican principles of the founding fathers” (which republicanism he rejects, on pages 283-284, as “substituting classical republicanism for democratic conceptions of American polity, religious orthodox for evangelical and experimental Christianity, and classical learning for modern infidelity”). If Tise is just plain wrong about 1776 (I refer here again to Pauline Maier’s *American Scripture* about the “remaking of the Declaration of Independence “ and the changing meaning of “equality” between 1776 and 1860, see pages xix-xx, 187-205), his denial of the radical nature of the French Revolution, or the second one of the Jacobins of 1792-1794 versus the liberal one of 1789-1791, does not square with modern research on this vast subject and its aftermath as already cited above in notes # 14, 16, and 18. About Garrison and immediate abolitionists, Tise is refuted by W. Caleb McDaniel, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery: Garrisonian Abolitionists & Transatlantic* Reform (Baton Rouge, 2013). Garrison early considered himself to be a citizen of the world and “part of a global community battling the Holy Alliance after 1815.” If not able to participate directly in European and Latin American wars of independence, he “found in the abolitionist movement his own way to fulfill simmering [Romantic and heroic] fantasies of joining the global battle for liberty.” To McDaniel, Garrison and his followers “were liberal [radical] nineteenth-century reformers.” The romantic poet Lord Byron was one of his heroes. (Ibid., 30, 31, 183.) Nineteenth-century perfectionist reformers may have appealed to the “Spirit of ’76,” but they viewed it anew in a present informed by Romantic philosophy and history (which is also to say radical French-Jacobin ideas revived after Napoleon).
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43

 Quoted in Sarah B. Paulus, “America’s Long Eulogy for Compromise: Henry Clay and American Politics, 1854-1858,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era*, 4 (March 2014), 28-52 quote on 41. See also W. Caleb McDaniel, “The Bonds and Boundaries of Antislavery,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era*, 4 (March 2014), 84-105, quotes on 93, 94. “Lincoln’s frequent professions that Republicans bore no ill will toward the South or its institutions struck many in the South as disingenuous.” (Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 171.) The South knew what Lincoln and the Republicans were all about. “Southerners understood the implications of their increasingly minority status within the government and the nation.” (Ibid., 172.)

44

 See Timothy M. Roberts, *Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism* (Charlottesville and London, 2009), 127, 141. For Emerson on Brown, see Merrill D. Peterson, *John Brown* (Charlottesville and London, 2002), 13. Contrary to Tise, who views opponents of abolitionism and Republicans as the real “fanatics” and dismiss their “embattled rhetoric” as an early form of the “Paranoid style” of American politics on the conservative side (see *Proslavery*, 358, 360), the views of McDaniel and Oakes above in text and Goldfield in note #43 and #45 confirm the veracity of the views expressed by the opponents of Lincoln and the Republicans. At the same time, in describing Garrison and his followers as committed political agitators and anarchists, McDaniel and Lewis Perry lend further credence to the negative assessment of anti-abolitionists posing a real threat to the American republic.
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 Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class* [Cambridge, UK and New York, 2005], 53, 55; McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 861; “Southern concerns about the northern perversion of republican principles were well taken. The nation of the founders no longer existed.” (Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 175.) “Marat, Robespierre, and the monsters of the French reign of terror, were among the first and most devoted champions of abolition.” (William Drayton, *The South Vindicated from the Treason and Fanaticism of the Northern Abolitionists* [Philadelphia, 1836], 171.) Drayton also raised the question of why abolitionists were agitating at all since any action against slavery was beyond their control? Their purpose, he noted in 1836, was “to raise a party in the North” by “souring Northern affection for the South.” (Ibid., 172.)
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See Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 45; Timothy M. Roberts, *Distant Revolutions*, 176, 177, 178, 179; Escott, *What Shall We Do With the Negro?*, 10. To Republicans, the Democratic cry for law, order, and peace in Kansas was the language of despotism in Europe. To William A. Seward, the heritage of 1776 included “a tradition of baptizing democracy in blood.” Indeed, “violence per se [in resistance to proslavery settlers] no longer seemed a sinister subversion of democracy.” (Goldfield, *America Aflame*, 114-115.)

47

 Lincoln to Henry L. Pierce and others, Fehrenbacher, ed., *Lincoln*: *Writings and Speeches*, April 6, 1859, 18-19.
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 Ibid. From 1854 to 1860, Lincoln “in an uncertain political climate” deliberately fashioned in a cautious manner a new “antislavery nationalism” that appealed to free soil Whigs and Democrats in the North and sought to make the Republican party more than a radical antislavery political organization. Eschewing fusion with Nativists in 1855-1856, he combined free labor ideology with free soil, a moral conviction of slavery’s wrongness, and a return to the principles of the Revolution, Lincoln was able to build a political coalition and hold it together to achieve electoral victory in 1860. Although “putatively conservative,” it was radical indeed. Lincoln’s “antislavery nationalism” reached “its zenith in his Cooper Union address of February 1860. “Yet antislavery nationalism also helped propel the nation to war.” (Graham A. Peck, “Abraham Lincoln and the Triumph of an Antislavery Nationalism,”, pages 3, 8, 9, 13 of printed electronic version from umich.edu.)
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 See Wood, “Alexis de Tocqueville and the Myth of Democracy in America”; What Happened to Republicanism? George Bancroft, the Myth of Democracy, and the Lost Causes of 1776, 1787, and 1861” and other works by the author cited above.
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Roberts, *Distant Revolutions*, 20, 189-190. See also David T. Gleeson and Simon Lewis, eds., *The Civil War as Global Conflict: Transnational Meanings of the American Civil War* (Columbia, S. C., 2014). According to the USC Press, “The contributors . . . reveal that Civil War-era attitudes toward citizenship and democracy were far from fixed or stable. Race, ethnicity, nationhood, and slavery were subjects of fierce controversy. Examining the Civil War in a global context requires us to see the conflict as a seminal event in the continuous struggle of people to achieve liberty and fulfill the potential of human freedom.” (Http://www.sc.edu/uscpress.)
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 George M. Frederickson provides a useful insight into Garrison’s life and beliefs. “But Garrison lived in a revolutionary world not totally unlike our own, and he could not escape thinking in terms of revolutionary precedents. The French and American revolutions at the end of the previous century had been followed by the European uprisings of 1830, and Garrison was clearly in sympathy with the results of these movements if not with their methods.” In a speech to a free Negro audience in 1831, Garrison noted: “The signs of the times do indeed show forth great and glorious and sudden changes in the condition of the oppressed. The whole temperament is tremendous with an excess of light; the earth is moved out of its place; the wave of revolution is dashing to pieces ancient and mighty empires; the hearts of tyrants are beginning to fail them for fear; and for looking forward to those things which are to come upon earth.” (*The Arrogance of Race*, 79.) For the early revolutions of 1815-1830, see Richard Stites, *The Four Horsemen: Riding to Liberty in Post-Napoleonic Europe* (Oxford, UK and New York, 2014).

 See also Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861* (Middletown, Connecticut, 1970, 1988); Barbara Packer, *The Transcendentalists* (Athens, Georgia, 2007); Philip Gura, *American Transcendentalism: A History* (New York, 2008); Mark Noll, *America’s God: From Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Oxford, UK and New York, 2002); Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: From Jefferson to Lincoln*; Tyler, *Freedom’s Ferment*; Parrington, *Romantic Revolution in America*; Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party* (New York, 1999). For Transcendentalist’s roots in German counter-Enlightenment idealism and later Romanticism through Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, see Bryan Hileman of Virginia Commonwealth University, “Transcendental Roots” at [http://transcendentalism-legacy.tamu.edu/roots](http://transcendentalism-legacy.tam.edu/roots) (American Transcendentalism Web).
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 Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom’s Ferment: Phases of American Social History from the Colonial Period to the Outbreak of the Civil War* (Minneapolis, 1944; New York, 1962), 5, 10. The operative paradigm here since the Civil War itself, both in historical and literary professional circles, has been to view the many newer “isms” of the North as no more than expansions of earlier democratic, egalitarian, abolitionists, and nationalist beliefs. See especially F. O. Matthiessen, *Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* (New York, 1941) and more recently Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven, 1989); Tise, *Proslavery*; Dirck, *Lincoln and the Constitution*; Goldfield, *America Aflame*, Escott, *“What Shall We Do With the Negro?”*; Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (Oxford, UK and New York, 2007); David S. Reynolds, *Waking Giant: America in the Age of Jackson* (New York, 2009); most Lincoln scholars, and authors cited in Woods, “What Twenty-First Century Historians Have Said about the Causes of Disunion.” On the many communal farms of the 1830’s and 1840’s like Oneida in New York, Brook Farm in Massachusetts, and Harmony in Indiana, David S. Kidder and Noah D. Oppenheim note that these efforts “reflected a particularly American strain of utopianism that attempted to infuse the nation’s growth with religious and political idealism.” (*The Intellectual Devotional: American History*, 89.) See also Reynolds, *Walt Whitman’s America: A Cultural Biography* (New York, 1995, 1996); *John Brown, Abolitionist: The Man Who Killed Slavery, Sparked the Civil War, and Seeded Civil Rights* (New York, 2005, 2006); and *Mightier Than the Sword: Uncle Tom’s Cabin and the Battle for America* (New York, 2011). But see also Reynolds, *Beneath the American Renaissance: The Subversive Imagination in the Age of Emerson and Melville* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1988, 1989); Frederick C. Crews, “Whose American Renaissance?, *New York Review of Book*s, October 27, 1988; and Nathaniel Hawthorne’s satirical critique of Brook Farm in his *The Blithedale Romanc*e (Boston, 1852) at Utopian Literature Collection, Yale University (<http://brbl-library.yale.edu/exhibitions/utopia/uc08.html>. In his *The Growth of American Thought* (New York, 1943), Merle Curti reflected an emerging consensus view with his American Enlightenment as “a middle-class phenomenon” and its “core ideas being “natural rights philosophy, deism, humanitarianism, progress, natural science, religious tolerance, limited government and laissez-faire economics.” Earlier, in *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven, 1932), Carl Becker identified “natural rights philosophy and universalism” with the American Enlightenment both of which ideas were “espoused by both Thomas Jefferson’s Declaration of Independence and Rousseau’s *Social Contract*.” (See John M. Dixon, “Henry F. May and the Revival of the American Enlightenment: Problems and Possibilities for Intellectual and Social History,” *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 71 (April 2014), 255-280 quotes on 266 and 267.) For a different Enlightenment, more secular and less democratic and egalitarian, see Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment* (2 vols., Princeton, 1966, 1970) and the works of Sir Isaiah Berlin. See also George L. Mosse, “Heavenly City Revisited,” New York Times, January 1, 1967, review of Gay’s first volume and Chris R. Tame, “The Revolution of Reason: Peter Gay, The Enlightenment and the Ambiguities of Classical Liberalism,” *Journal of Libertarian Studies*, 3 (1977), 217-227. Worth noting too is Curti’s “The Great Mr. Locke: American Philosopher, 1783-1861,” *Huntington Library Bulletin*, 11 (April 1937, 107-151 and Locke’s continuing influence in the nineteenth century in the North.
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 David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Oxford, UK and New York, 1999), 41, 42. Also Chap. One, “What the Abolitionists Were Up Against,” 39-83 and Chap. Four, “The Boundaries of Idealism,” 164-212. “To recall the fears and suspicions aroused by the Federal Constitution, or the vehement opposition to Hamilton’s modest experiments with centralized planning, is to begin to appreciate the distance between the ideal of emancipation and its effective implementation.” Although “the patriots of the Revolution were self-professed enemies of every form of tyranny,” their “liberal ideology may have raised obstacles to ‘unearned’ emancipation. Since the Revolution tended to define liberty as the reward for righteous struggle, it was difficult to think of freedom as something that could be granted to supposedly passive slaves.” “A pragmatic regard for limits, coupled with uncompromising moral judgment, characterized the entire Enlightenment approach to slavery. The later achievement of men like Garrison and Phillips lay, to a large extent, in freeing abstract principles and judgments from a heavy ballast of qualifications.” (Chap. 6, “The Emancipation of America, I,” 255-284, quotes on 257, 264-266.) Davis specifically references the influence of German idealism and the writings of Kant and Wilhelm von Humboldt. Romanticism, however, does not appear in the index. See also Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca, 1966); *Inhuman Bondage; Davis, The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World (*Oxford, UK and New York, 2008*)*, and note 54below.
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Fehrenbacher, *Prelude to Greatness*, 95. “With the coming of fine new work reinterpreting the northern origins of the Civil War in antislavery politics, and the northern soldiers’ and home-front responses to the war, it is high time to look again at what happened to the North in the years after the war, and [Caroline E. Janney’s] *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconciliation* [Chapel Hill, 2012] provides important corrections and connections for such scholarship.” (Gregory P. Downs, City College and Graduate Center, CUNY, review, in *Journal of Southern History*, LXXX [August 2014], 735-737 quote on 737). Se also Andrew L. Slap and Michael Thomas Smith, eds., *This Distracted and Anarchial People: New Answers for Old Questions about the Civil War-Era North* (New York, 2013).

Germanic idealistic philosophy as later Romanticism (combining perfectionism with nationalism) developed from the radical Jacobins of the second French Revolution of 1792-1794 who emerged as the leaders of the *Sans culotte* (the poor of the working classes and the peasantry chafing under medieval feudal obligations and burdens and deteriorating economic conditions to which French absolute government contributed by financial mismanagement). Influenced by the utopian philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau (died 1778) and his disciple, Maximillien Roberspierre, was liberty redefined as the actual equality of men (rather than before the law) and government or the state mandated to assure this outcome and more (according to the “General Will”). From Rousseau’s idea of humans being born perfectly was the subversive notion of existing government and society in France and elsewhere being identified as the great obstacle to individuals not enjoying a better life than they did. In France, reform began modestly with the first French Revolution of 1789-1791. Liberal, enlightened, and limited in purpose and influenced by the earlier American War of Independence, philosophes and politicos were content with a constitutional government, a new constitution (limiting monarchial power with indirect popular voting), and the abolition of privileged estates or classes. Reform it was and not a revolution.

 Thereafter, everything changed for the worse. As radical Jacobins gained political influence in the Estates General to declare a new republic in 1792, deteriorating economic conditions and a War against Tyranny (the monarchies of Europe who threatened to intervene if Louis XIV were harmed), resulted in radical new measures: the abolition of slavery in the French colonies and government control of the economy to prosecute the republican war against absolute governments. When this sacred war began to falter, Jacobins suspected internal subversion coming from liberals and monarchists alike. Thus the internal war against enemies of the republic that became the infamous “Reign of Terror.” French “liberty, egalitê and fraternity” now included the new ideas or “isms” of nationalism and socialism. These revolutionary ideas were then spread across Europe by armies of the Republic and later of Napoleon between 1792 and 1815. In reaction to French invasions, German nationalism was born and idealistic philosophy too.

We know it as Romanticism.

For Romanticism in New England by the early 1800’s (and not the South), as expressed in a new religious and reform fervor (temperance, anti-slavery, and “ a variety of other causes”), see Mason, *Slavery & Politics in the Early Republic*, 164-167. “The boundlessness and zeal of this evangelizing movement, radiating as it did from England and New England, frightened many Southern slaveholders. Then as later did such a “philanthropic spirit” pose “dire, unintended consequences.” These “so-called philanthropists were so arrogant as to dismiss the light of scripture and the lessons of history in the pursuit of their chimerical theories.” (Ibid., 164, 165.) In New England, according to Philip Gura, “Germany’s rich religious and artistic culture” was discovered as was “philosophical idealism” before 1815.” After the War of 1812, New Englanders began to visit overseas and study at German universities. Many with Harvard connections earned higher degrees there and returned to Cambridge to promote the new German learning. (*American Transcendentalism*, 23-37.) The literary-philosophical renaissance in New England “resulted from the impact of the romantic revolution upon the Puritan mind.” “From the abundant stores of European revolutionary doctrine the New England liberals drew freely—more freely perhaps from German idealism than from French Utopianism . . . . But the renaissance was very much more than a transplanting of German idealism. France had a shaping hand in it, and England. Jean Jacques [Rousseau] came before Hegel, and Unitarianism before transcendentalism.” (Parrington, *The Romantic Revolution in America, 1800-1860*, 317-318, but see “Book III, The Mind of New England: Part II, The Rise of Liberalism [Romanticism] and Part III: The Transcendental Mind,” 317-426.) See also Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861 (*Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1970). Howe, however, denies the revolutionary influence of Germanic idealism on Romantic perfectionism and nationalism in the North on its path to Civil War in 1861-1865 in *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*.

Besides Lincoln’s and Seward’s Romantic historical revisionism about 1776 and 1787, see also Susan-Mary Grant’s analysis of John Lothrop Motley’s views that 1776 and 1787 both made America a “nation” (*North Over South*, 163) and Eric Foner on “Salmon P. Chase: The Constitution and the Slave Power” in *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 73-102. Chase “developed an interpretation of American history which convinced thousands of northerners that anti-slavery was the intended policy of the founders of the nation, and was fully compatible with the Constitution.” (Ibid., 73.) But see Fehrenbacher, *The Slaveholding Republic* and the Constitution being “neither proslavery nor antislavery I intent.” (Ibid., x.) He also noted that the a neo-Garrisonian view of the Constitution as a proslavery compact “retained a surprising vitality and had more adherents in the late twentieth century than ever before.”(Ibid., 12.) “It was the Garrisonians who, in the long run, proved to be the more persuasive theorists. Their view of the Constitution as culpably proslavery, although endorsed by relatively few Americans, was perpetuated by abolition-minded historians after the Civil War and has gained wide acceptance in modern historical scholarship.” (Ibid., 38.)

 For more on newer “isms” in the North, political as well as literary, theological and philosophical, contributing to a negative image of the South and an impulse to reform America by ridding it of the great evil of slavery, see Grant, *North Over South*, 37-60 (“A World Apart: The Romance and Reality of the South”) and 111-129 (Representative Mann: The Republican Experiment and the South”). See also Anne Norton’s discussion of Herman Melville and Walt Whitman in *Alternative Americas*, chaps. 10 and 12, 277-292 and 315-329. The title for “Part Five” is appropriately “The Reformation” and also includes chap. 11, Lincoln, The Great Emancipator,” 293-314. The importance of religion, i.e., the rise of liberal, humans as already perfected, non-Trinitarian Unitarianism in the North and the persistence of Calvinism and the reality of sin and human imperfection in the South, cannot be emphasized enough. See especially Mark Noll, *America’s God*; Gura, *American Transcendentalism*; and Susan Jacoby, *Freethinkers.*

See also “Johann Gottfried Herder,” in Modern History Source Book at [www.fordham.edu](http://www.fordham.edu);“Romanticism” in *Wikipedia*; “Romanticism” at [www.philosophybasics.com](http://www.philosophybasics.com);“Reform,” “Evangelical Reform,” “Transcendentalism,” and “AntiSlavery” at <http://enotes.com.reform-reference>; *American History Through Literature, 1870-1920 (*3 vols., New York, 2005); Frederick C. Beiser, *Revolution and Romanticism: The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought, 1790-1800* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1992); Gregory Eislein, *Literature and Humanitarian Reform in the Civil War Era* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1996; Beiser, *The Romantic Imperative: The Concept of Early German Romanticism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2006); Lee R. Brown, *The Emerson Museum: Practical Romanticism and the Pursuit of the Whole* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1997); and Bussell B. Nye, *William Lloyd Garrison and the Humanitarian Reformers* (Boston, 1955). The direct influence of Germanic literature and philosophy on Walt Whitman is detailed in David S. Reynolds, *Walt Whitman’s America: A Cultural Biography* (New York, 1995), 252-254. George Bancroft studied in Germany for a new Ph. D. and then returned to Harvard College to teach. He also served as president of the American Unitarian Association from 1825 to 1836. See Wood, “George Bancroft, the Myth of Democracy, and the Lost Causes of 1776, 1787, and 1861”; “George Bancroft,” in *Wikipedia*; David Levin, *History as Romantic Art* (Stanford, California, 1959); and Richard Vitzthum, *The American Compromise: Theme and Method in the Histories of Bancroft, Parkman, and Adams* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1974).

Despite “New Approaches to Internationalizing the History of the Civil War Era,” Northern nationalism and its nineteenth century origins seems strangely conspicuous by its absence and tantalizing references to those “Revolutions of 1848” in Europe of which Lincoln and the Republicans were well aware. Meanwhile, Southern and Confederate Nationalism continue to be emphasized despite its nonexistence. The South remained eighteenth century republican in character and spirit and its cause was one in defense of the old republic not the creation of a new nation. See Wood, “The Union of the States,” Norton, *Alternative Americas*, and Grant, *North Over South*. For a more positive and informative global perspective on the South than the one below, see Joan E. Cashin, “Southern History in Global Perspective: Vagaries of War, Region, and Memory,” in *The Journal of the Historical Society*, 11 (December 2011), 425-439 and Peter Colcanis, “Lee’s Lieutenants: The American South and the World,” ibid., 441-461.

 A consideration of the Lost Cause as serious history is also absent from “Forum: the Future of Civil War Era Studies,” *The Journal of the Civil War Era*, 2(March 2012) and Woods, “What Twenty-First Century Historians Have Said about the Causes of Disunion.”