SpencerGanttDraftRevview

Fortuitously for the general reading public, Spencer Gantt just happened upon a local sports blog from his Columbia, SC home that was also about the latest CSA flag controversy and the NAACP-led protest against the Confederate banner still flying atop the State House. Having long considered it a symbol of slavery, racism, and hate (somehow not associated with the Stars and Stripes or the British Union Jack), the NAACP organized a campaign with the NCAA to impose a ban against state colleges and universities from hosting regional championships in all sanctioned sports. Although the CSA flag was removed from atop the Capitol building, it was put in another location on state grounds but still considered to be in a place of sovereignty.. The NAACP protest continues as does the NCAA ban.

 Here are some revealing online reader comments posted anonymously. ” XanderB” (tag name), “I can’t believe people make such a big deal about a damn Flag. It’s nothing more than a historical piece of the state’s History.” The controversy, however, was about more than history as “Hubert39” observed. “The flag was removed from the dome. That’s what the S. C. blacks wanted. The ‘South Carolina’ Black leadership did not have a problem with the flag being flown on the State House grounds at the Confederate statue. It’s the national NAACP who [sic] don’t want the flag flown anywhere. Know what I say?” Speaking to another issue, “emm” noted: “Isn’t Columbia getting ready to have it’s Black Expo? Isn’t that a violation of the boycott? Charleston had their Black Expo a few months ago; violation of the boycott? CNN employee Roland Martin came to spew racist venom. Isn’t he coming to Columbia? What hypocrisy - on about a million different levels.” In a similar vein, one “Foolio” observed that “If you are a black person waiting tables and the boycott costs you money because tourists stay home, how is the NAACP helping you? They are not and don’t really care. This is a true example of the most misguided group of professional victims that I can think of. Also, I thought the ‘compromise’ of taking the flag off the statehouse and putting it on state house grounds was agreed would be OK. We did it, and the NAACP, big surprise, wants more. If ever there was an organization that outlived its usefulness, this is it.” (See also Ron Morris, sports columnist, “Confederate Flag Remains a Distraction to Sports” and “Flag Still Costs State NCAA spotlight,” in *The State*, 8-2-2009 and 3-21-2010; James Harley, “NAACP Keeps Flag in the News,” ibid., 2-1-2010; Jamie Self, staff writer, “The Confederate Flag Still Divides, Whites, Blacks,” ibid., 11-22-2014.)

One hundred and fifty years ago or so, it was much the same with the Lincoln-Republican myth of a “Slave Power Conspiracy.” Fortunately, Mr. Gantt also had access via the same sports’ blog to the “Comments” section and to dissenting views from the biased ones of the NAACP and the NCAA. From there, Mr. Gantt was led to Jim Goad’s *The Redneck Manifesto* and James and Donald Kennedy’s *The South Was Right* (each still worthy of being read today). Therein did he discover “surprising information which [he] had never read, never imagined, and never been taught.” (xiii) By no means alone, Gantt, as a Southerner and a concerned citizen, began his own search for the historical truth about the conflict of 1861-1865 and to present the “rest of the story.” Unabashedly anti-status quo, like many other writers he cites, his aim and theirs is a presentation of the facts of the past equally to “shed light on the complicity of many who claim to be ‘pure and without sin’ when it comes to the great evils of slavery and Lincoln’s War.” (xiv)

 It all begins, of course, with slavery. “We all think that Southerners started the war and fought to retain slavery even though 94 % of the population did not own slaves and did not want slaves [John W. Blassingame, in *The Slave Community*: *Plantation Life in the Antebellum South*, 1972, gives a figure of 75% along with one of 385,000 total slaveholders]. Nothing is ever as simple as it seems.” (xiv) And he his correct. That the South alone is blamed for the Civil War, and slavery made its sole cause and the central theme of Southern history, past and present (i.e., the resolve to maintain the South as a “White Man’s land”) is not only the popular view, but the one written and taught by professional historians. Gantt calls it “PC History” and what’s “being taught in the Federal Union government schools” or FUG.” (xiv, 47, 48, 115, 125, 163) Convenient as it is, and useful too for political purposes, presentist research in the service of partisanship is not history at all but myth as propaganda. (See W. Kirk Wood, *Nullification, A Constitutional History, 1776-1833*, 2 vols., 2008, 2009; and “Reactionary South Bibliography” and “A Declaration of Independence Not Equality: Historians Tell the Truth about 1776” at [www.nullificationhistory.com](http://www.nullificationhistory.com). For highly critical accounts of the modern South and Confederate nostalgia that perpetuates Southern racism alone, see David Goldfield, *Still Fighting the Civil War: The American South and Southern History*, 2002 and Tony Horowitz, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*, 1998. For a corrective to the Northern-Lincoln-Republican-abolition myth, see Tony Horowitz, “150 Years of Misunderstanding the Civil War,” *The Atlantic*, June 19, 2013 and the academically rigorous books by Thomas DiLorenzo.)

 For the first part of *Slavery and Lincoln’s War*, readers are presented with an informed albeit necessarily brief history of slavery from ancient through medieval times, literally around the world, including Egypt, Greece, Rome, Europe, and Africa including Christians, Muslims, and, yes, black Africans. “Slavery from its beginning, was always a totally accepted practice with the thought (by the owners, of course) that there was no wrongdoing being perpetrated on those unfortunate enough to be enslaved. The slaves probably did not see it that way. But from the very beginning up until the 1700’s, virtually no one had a problem with the institution of slavery. Once again, no one but the slaves.” (3-4) “During all the millennia from ancient times to the 1700s, it is doubtful there was scarcely a conscious thought regarding the well-being or human worth of anyone who was a slave. Slavery was a universal entity whereby people of any and all races, creeds, colors, cultures, religions, countries, etc. were enslaved by someone.” (77) On this point, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (1966) David B. Davis acclaimed study, confirms the views of Mr. Gantt

 Familiar as the trans-Atlantic slave trade is with its horrible “Middle Passage,” the trans-Saharan slave trade of the Muslims is forgotten. “In sheer numbers of people taken, particularly black Africans, the Eastern trade toll of TEN TO TWENTY MILLION souls is comparable to the Atlantic trade. It is also likely that when the European slave trade ceased in the 1800’s, the Eastern trade increased.” (19) “Yes, slavery existed in Africa⎯as did a slave trade⎯long before the Europeans came calling. Without this system in place, it is unlikely that the enslavement of millions of Africans throughout the western hemisphere would have been possible. Contrary to popular belief, there were very few forays by the white man into the darkest jungles of Africa to capture natives . . . .” (21) Not mentioned by Mr. Gantt is the practice of slavery among Native Americans before and after the coming of the Europeans and the role of black African men and women as facilitators and intermediaries in negotiating slave sales. (See Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: the First Two Hundred Years of Slavery in America*, 1998, and recent studies and reviews of same in the prestigious *William and Mary Quarterly*: Brett Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France*, 2012; Barbara Krauthamer, *Black Slaves, Indian Masters: Slavery, Emancipation, and Citizenship in the Native American South*, 2013; Edward B. Rugemer, “The Development of Mastery and Race in the Comprehensive Slave Codes of the Greater Caribbean During the Seventeenth Century,” *W&MQ*, 70 [July 2013], 429-458; “Pernille Ipsen, “’The Christened Mulatresses’: Euro-African Families in a Slave-Trading Town,” ibid., 70 [April 2013], 371-398; and Randy Sparks, *Where the Negroes Are Masters: An African Port in the Era of the Slave Trade,* 2014.)

 With respect to the trans-Atlantic slave trade, British North America was a marginal recipient of enslaved black Africans. Of the millions of slaves transported to the New World, 90 % were shipped to the Caribbean, Brazil, and South America. “Those taken to British North America numbered about 500,000. (48) In time, this number became almost 4,000, 000 by 1860, making slavery in America the only society where the slave population reproduced itself since the slave trade was banned beginning in 1808. In North America, the replacement of white bound labor bly enslaved black Africans was promoted by mercantilist policies of a Great Britain in the process of becoming an empire between 1650 and 1750. Large-scale staple crop production by enslaved labor created exports that contributed financially to the treasury and thus the strength of the state and monarchy. (See Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*; Steve Pincus, “Rethinking Mercantilism: Political Economy in the British Empire and the Atlantic World in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 69 [January 2012], 3-34; Cathy Matson, “Imperial Political Economy: An Ideological Debate and Shifting Policies,” ibid., 35-40; Susan D. Amussen, “Political Economy and Imperial Practice,” ibid., 47-51; Trevor Burnard, “Making a Whig Empire Work: Transatlantic Politics and the Imperial Economy in Britain and British America,” ibid., 51-57; and Steve Pincus, “Reconfiguring the British Empire,” ibid., 63-70. Also, Jonathan P. Eacott, “Making an Imperial Compromise: The Calico Acts, the Atlantic Colonies, and the Structure of the British Empire,” ibid., 69 [October 2012], 731-762 and Sarah Kinkel, “The King’s Pirates? Naval Enforcement of Imperial Authority, 1740-76,” ibid., 71 [January 2014], 3-34.).

Crucial to the slave trade from Africa to the Caribbean and between the latter and New England, including enslaved Native Americans, were Northern entrepreneurs employed in shipping and commerce and investing in Caribbean plantations. In this phase of the slave trade, Mr. Gantt takes some pleasure in underscoring the complicity of New England merchants and even Puritan divines in promoting and directly benefitting by the trade in slaves, black and red! Again, more recent research substantiates his views however disconcerting they may be!! Two books cited by the author are most important: Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and ‘Race’ in New England, 1780-1860* (1998) and the highly regarded *Complicity: How the North Promoted, Prolonged and Profited from Slavery (*2006) by Anne Farrow, Joel Long, and Jennifer Frank of *The Hartford Courant*. (See also Richard A. Bailey, *Race and Redemption in Puritan New England*, 2011; Bernard Bailyn, *The Barbarous Years: The Peopling of British North America: The Conflict of Civilizations, 1600-1675*, 2012; Craig S. Wilder, *Ebony & Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America’s Universities*, 2013; Linford D. Fisher, “’Dangerous Designes’: The 1676 Barbados Act to Prohibit New England Indian Slave Importation,” *William & Mary Quarterly*, 71 [January 2014], 99-124; and “Jonathan Edwards’ Defense of Slavery,” *Massachusetts Historical Review*, 4 (2002), 23-59. “Jonathan Edwards owned slaves until the day he died in 1759.” ([Www.yaleslavery.org](http://Www.yaleslavery.org) and “Yale, Slavery and Abolition” project.) As Larry E. Tise reminds us in *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840* (1987), pro-slavery arguments were first developed in New England!)

Gantt’s graphic description of being chained, lying in vomit and excrement, eating garbage, and not seeing daylight for long periods is all too familiar and unimaginable. It was what white bound labor experienced in the “trans-Atlantic white slave trade.” (41-45) For the 100,000 Britons who “migrated to the tobacco coast” in the 1600’s, at least 70 % ofwhom were indentured servants and many of whom were vagrants actually kidnapped along with convicts, the voyage over was hardly a pleasure cruise. Nor was the process of being hired. Beyond the “immediate problem” of survival from diseases, there were horrible living conditions to endure and brutal treatment by desperate masters not all of whom were “paternal” or “benevolent.” Black Africans or “negars” or “negors” “had begun appearing in very small numbers well before 1619 . . . . Their numbers rose very slowly, their arrivals random occurrences.” Numbering in the hundreds in Maryland before reaching 1, 190 in 1670 (19 percent of the population) and 2,000 in Virginia, “there was as yet no wholesale importation of slaves.” Most of these did not arrive directly from Africa but indirectly from the Caribbean, Barbados, Dutch islands, and Spanish settlements and they were multi-lingual. “Some came as freemen and remained free.” When black African slavery became the norm, without “prior design” but logical, it developed “in the course of three generations by ambitious planters and merchants in the Chesapeake colonies desperate for profits, familiar with human degradation, and freed from moral scruples by their deep, pervasive racism.” (Bailyn, *The Barbarous Years*,” 162-179.)

 If emancipation in the North was “Much Ado About Nothing” (73), servitude by other names persisted there and in the old Northwest. So, too, did Black Codes in both regions. (73-75) “A black person was a pariah in the North, and in the West and Midwest as well.” (70) Racism, it appears, was an American and not just a Southern phenomena. Northerners including abolitions were not “racial egalitarians. “Once free, however, blacks were relegated to the ghettoes and gutters, and not truly emancipated as bona fide members of society. For decades, Africans struggled to attain equality in the North” and “segregation was rampant in all public places . . . . White Northerners and Abolitionists in particular did not give a damn about the black race as humans. They wanted slavery ended and they wanted the Africans freed, yes, but just not around them.” (81-82) In other words, abolition was an abstraction. It was about free labor more than black equality, i.e., an end to the legality of human ownership in property. Gene Datel, author of *Cotton and Race in the Making of America: The Human Costs of Economic Power* (New York, 2011) underscores the pervasiveness of Northern racism:

The attitude of white Northerners during the nineteenth

century towards African Americans provides both a

very clear guide and a determining factor to the fate

of blacks after emancipation. We should not only

ask what white Northerners thought about slavery,

but what they thought about black people. Historians

choose either to ignore or to underestimate vastly the role

of the white North in assigning free blacks second-class

citizenship. As such, historians have manufactured a

fairy tale in which the South is the sole scapegoat for

America’s racial dilemma.

(See Stephen Middleton, *The Black Laws of the Old Northwest*, 1993; W. Caleb McDaniel, *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery: Garrisonian Abolitionists and Transatlantic Reform*, 2013; Diana Wiener, *Race and Rights: Fighting Slavery and Prejudice in the Old Northwest, 1830-1870*, 2013; Darrel Dexter, *Bondage in Egypt: Slavery in Southern Illinois*, 2011; David G. Smith, *On the Edge of Freedom: The Fugitive Slave Issue in South Central Pennsylvania, 1820-1870*, 2012; and Gene Datel, quoted from “King Cotton, the North, and Civil War,” *The New Criterion*, 33 [October 2014], 16-21.)

Out west, the movement to restrict slavery from the Missouri crisis of 1819-1820 through the Wilmot Proviso of 1846 and beyond was racially motivated as well. “Free Soil” meant no blacks at all, whether slave or free. The slogan of the new Republican Party of 1854-1860, “Free Soil, Free Labor, and Free Men,” was hardly egalitarian. Abraham Lincoln shared the same black prejudice of his Illinois constituency as other leading Republicans in Ohio, New York, and other Northern states. While Mr. Gantt cites Lerone Bennett’s, *Forced into Glory: Abraham Lincoln’s White Dream* (2000), other books by Lincoln defenders underscore his own racism and that of the North. (See Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War* (1970); George Frederickson, “A Man But Not A Brother: Abraham Lincoln and Racial Equality,” in *The Arrogance of Race* (Hanover, New Hampshire, 1988, 54-72). For more on Lincoln’s racial views, see Brian R. Dirck, ed., *Lincoln Emancipated: The President and the Politics of Race* (Dekalb, Illinois, 2007); Dirck, *Abraham Lincoln and White America* (Lawrence, Kansas, 2012); and Richard Striner, *Lincoln and Race* (Carbondale, Illinois, 2012.); Paul D. Escott, *“What Shall We Do with the Negro?” Lincoln, White Racism, and Civil War America* (2009); and Henry Louis Gates, Jr., *Lincoln on Race and Slavery* (2010). David B. Davis, *Inhuman Bondage*: *The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (2006) refers to “blatant antiblack racism in the North.” (Ibid., 280.) See also Stephen John Hartnett, *Democratic Dissent & The Cultural Fictions of Antebellum America* (Urbana and Chicago, 2002), especially “Proslavery Cultural Fictions, White Fear, and the Rhetoric of Serious Evils,” 40-92. “Proslavery cultural fictions . . .were not simply a Southern phenomena but part of a much larger, national culture of white supremacy. (Ibid., 91.) The real paradox of Republican racism and slavery non-extension cannot be fully explored here although it needs to be (with Hartnett in fact talking about “three interrelated paradoxes regarding slavery,” 45).

The “Slavery” part of the book and title, which is quite good and historically accurate, sets the stage for “Lincoln’s War” that was about more than slavery. As with slavery and racism, “Secessionism was a watchword of the United States long before it ever became identified with the South.” (100) In the aftermath of Jefferson’s Louisiana Purchase of 1803, some states in the Union began “’’bitchin’ and moanin’ about this land grab, about how hard it was going to be for their economy, and how they were going to secede from the Union . . . . Why, it’s our old buds once again, the New England states.” (100) In response to a “call for a Northern Confederacy, President Jefferson stated: “Let them by all means if it is for their happiness to do so. It is but the older and younger son differing. God bless them both, and keep them in Union if it be for their good, but separate them if better.” (101) New England secessionism was threatened again during the War of 1812. At the Hartford Convention in late 1814, it was proclaimed that “New England states had the right to avow their own sovereignty against any federal infringement on said sovereignty.” (102) In the early republic, separation would have been “sensible and reasonable . . . .” Then “No one raised a big stink or fuss about any of it. There was no talk of war to preserve the Union. No sending federal troops to invade the northeast to put down the evil secessionists.” (101,102).

Secession, he makes clear, was legitimate and invoked by seceding states as a “right of revolution” proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence of 1776. Then did the English colonists tell the British that they “were through with being governed by them . . . . That’s right! Leaving! The North American British Colonies seceded from the British Empire.” Not liking this and opposing it (in the name of sovereignty indivisible versus *imperium in imperio*, to clarify what Mr. Gantt leaves out), the government of Great Britain “sent over large armies of redcoats to put our colonist forefathers in their place. But it didn’t work out well for the English, as the colonies won this American Revolution for the right to self-government. It would have been better if they had just let us go. There would have been no bloodshed, no lives lost, and the result would have been exactly the same.” An independent America would have continued “to trade, deal, and exist with Great Britain and all the other countries of the world.” (99-100) (See Wood, *Nullification, A Constitutional History, 1776-1833*; Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, 1967 and more recently John Phillip Reid, *Constitutional History of the American Revolution*, 4 volumes, 1986-1993 and Jack P. Greene, *The Constitutional Origins of the American Revolution*, 2011.)

“About 80 years later, the exact same thing happened with seven Southern states wanting to form their own government and go their own way. But, the Northern states [those who voted for Abraham Lincoln and the Republicans] said, “Oh, no, you can’t go. We won’t let you. The Union is perpetual, and can never be broken. You can never leave.” (100) There is much to this historical parallel between King George III and the British Parliament denying local control over internal matters to the English colonists in North America and Lincoln and the Republicans doing the same thing to the seceding Southern States. Indeed, 1763-1776 and 1848-1861 are not only equal in terms of years, but also as final crises resulting in armed conflict. In 1776, the colonial cause was a defense of the ancient rights of Englishmen against a Parliamentary-monarchial absolute government refusing to allow local control over internal affairs. In the American Civil War of Northern origins, it was the South defending the federal republic of 1776-1787 and the Constitution as ratified as a limited government with political power not sovereignty divided among governments, state and federal. For this comparison, see John M. Murrin, “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. (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.” [Ibid., 426.] Also see Michael A. Morrison, *Slavery and the American West: The Eclipse of Manifest Destiny and the Coming of the Civil War* (1997) wherein North and South and Democrat and Republican alike all appeal to the “Spirit of 1776” to justify their respective views about the Declaration (of Independence as self-government or equality?], the Constitution [creating a federal or national government), and slavery.] 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].)

 Secession, however, was not the cause of a civil war between the North and the South. No war ensued before March 4, 1861 and Lincoln’s official inauguration as 16th president. Until then, in the “First Secession Movement,” seven Southern states had withdrawn from the Union to form a separate and temporary CSA. There was no war yet because the ruling Democratic party under James Buchanan still believed in the union of the states as a compact. Although opposed to secession, the administration and many others were equally opposed to coercion. Despite federal military maneuverings at Ft. Pickens in Pensacola, Florida and Ft. Sumter in Charleston, SC, federal occupation of these forts did not happen and efforts to do so were either successfully negotiated or repulsed as in the case of the Star of the West expedition to Ft. Sumter. Between March 4 and April 15, Lincoln pursued a different strategy with the aim of maneuvering the Confederates into firing the first shot(s) that made them the aggressors in the conflict soon to be declared by Abraham Lincoln. The desired result occurred in Charleston harbor on April 12, 1861 when Confederate batteries fired upon Ft. Sumter. On April 12, 1861, President Lincoln called for 75,00 volunteers to suppress the “rebellion” down South. Viewed as “coercion,” that meant an end to the old Union as a federal republic, the “conditional Unionism” of four upper South states rapidly dissipated as they too proceeded to secede from the Union that was no more. In the “Second Secession Movement.” (“State rights might be humbug in fact, but it was a very convenient theory. The people were sovereign, not collectively as ‘one people,’ but separately as several states; therefore, they could by the exercise of their sovereignty in state conventions secede from the Union. South Carolina scrupulously observed the theory in December 1860. Others took considerable liberties with it. Generally, however, the secession movement was a remarkable testament to the compact theory of government, which Jefferson more than anyone, had fixed upon the American political mind.” Merrill D. Peterson, *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind*, 1962, 213.)

 For the complex maneuverings related both to Ft. Pickens and Ft. Sumter, and between the Democrat Buchanan and the Republican Lincoln, Gantt’s chapters on each are ably presented. So too is his conclusion. “If Lincoln had maneuvered the South into firing the first shot and starting the war, it was a master stroke.” In a letter to Gustavus V. Fox on May 1, 1861, Lincoln wrote: You and I both anticipated that the cause of the country would be advanced by making the attempt to provision Fort Sumter, even if it should fail; and it is no small consolation now to feel that our anticipation is justified by the result.” To Gantt, “Lincoln got what he wanted.” (130) A war to preserve the union first. Abolition would come later. (For the record, David H. Donald, in his *Lincoln* study of 1995, had Lincoln writing to Orville Browning earlier. “The plan succeeded. They attacked Sumter⎯it fell, and thus did more service that it otherwise could.” Lincoln’s letter to Fox follows. Donald, however, cannot admit that “Lincoln sought to provoke war.” Yet Donald proceeds “cryptically” himself. “His repeated efforts to avoid collision in the months between his inauguration and the firing on Fort Sumter showed that he adhered to his vow not to be the first to shed fraternal blood.” Between this vow and the one not to surrender the forts, which he was convinced would lead to the ‘actual, and immediate dissolution of the Union.” “The only resolution of these contradictory positions was for the Confederates to fire the first shot. The attempt to relieve Fort Sumter provoked them to do just that . . . . After the attack, he told Congress, ‘no choice was left but to call out the war power of the Government and so to resist force, employed for its destruction, by force, for its preservation.” Ibid., 293-294. Russell McClintock is less circumspect. “I conclude that Lincoln acted as peacefully as he could given the political circumstances and his own ideological constraints . . . . I am unconvinced by David M. Potter’s argument that Lincoln’s strategy could have avoided war in 1861, or, more to the point, that the president himself had any hope that it could. More persuasive is Kenneth Stampp’s position⎯as he refined it three decades after publication of And the War Came⎯that once Lincoln realized war was inevitable, he acted to make its commencement somehow advantageous to the central government. Whether this strategy was devious simply depends on one’s perspective. In the view of the Confederates, it certainly was . . . .” See *Lincoln and the Decision for War: The Northern Response to Secession (*2008), 11.

“In actuality, the Civil War began not when the Southern states seceded but when the Northern states acted forcibly to stop them. In the end it was Northerners who decided whether it was to be peace or a sword. Settling that question, in fact, lay at the heart of Northern debates.” As McClintock further noted, “the written record [of the time] contains the outlines of two very different conceptions of American nationalism . . . . Democrats primarily . . . emphasized federalism and the voluntary nature of the Union. The problem, in their eyes, was the Republicans’ moralistic efforts to impose their views on the South, which threatened to undermine the federal system the Founders had created. To coerce the seceded states back into the Union through force of arms would destroy republican government, they said.” On the other side, “Hard-liners . . .that is, most Republicans . . .grounded their opposition to compromise and support the possible use of force in the sanctity of both the rule of law and the Union itself. To give in to Southern demands, they believed, would set a precedent that would subvert the electoral process and render republican government impossible; to permit secession to occur would set a precedent that would make any kind of government impossible.” To McClintock, “Without slavery, there would have been no secession, certainly, and thus no war⎯but slavery itself did not spark the Civil War. Secession did.” See ibid.,3, 9 ix. “The first gun fired at Fort Sumter, smashed the old Union and with it the political design of Thomas Jefferson. The War seemed suddenly to have rendered the fabled age of the republic unusable.” See Merrill D. Peterson, *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind*, 1962, 216.)

Historically speaking, Abraham Lincoln was wrong about secession and coercion to enforce federal law by the use of federal troops. Although proposed in 1787, such an idea was rejected. Speaking in the Virginia ratifying convention, “James Madison of Virginia and fourth president of the States spoke against such use of troops. ‘The use of force against a State would look more like a declaration of war than in infliction of punishment, and would probably be considered as a dissolution of all previous compacts by which it might be bound.’” “And so it was seen exactly that way by the Southern States, by many Northern States, by many people and many nations. Unfortunately, Lincoln and his Republican Party did not agree.” (96-97). (Lincoln could cite the 1795 Militia Act because he refused to acknowledge secession as a legitimate right of revolution derived from the Declaration of 1776 as its first and primary purpose. Calling secession “anarchy” and much more, Lincoln always, for nefarious purposes, believed it to be a “rebellion” so national authority could be exercised in the process not of preserving the old union but of remaking America into a new nation at last united. A quote by Henry Hallam (1777-1859), author of The *Constitutional History of England* (3 vols., 1838-1839) comes to mind. Referring to the English Civil War of 1642-1649, he wrote that “*The aggressor in war in not the first who uses force, but the first who renders force necessary."*)

Not only was secession legitimate as a “natural right” of revolution, it was constitutional as well proceeding from the voluntary nature of the new American compact of government secured by the Constitution of 1787-1788 (not a mythical one of 1787 that never was as only a plan of government, but the one that was amended conditionally and ratified by the states in 1787-1788. As late as 1824, the intent of the framers could only be found in the Constitution as ratified by the people of the states in their several conventions (see letter to Henry Lee, April 25, 1824 in Jack N. Rakove, ed., *James Madison: Writings*, 1999.). As a federal republic and limited government, America remained a union of the states by a voluntary compact among them. In the early history of the republic, “Union” was a means to liberty (defined in the negative as freedom from government) and not as an end in itself. Again does Mr. Gantt tell the truth. The Constitution, he writes, was “a compact, an agreement among equals to live and govern in peace with mutual self-interest, mutual self-defense, and mutual respect for each other . . . . Surely it was not meant to be the *steel trap* envisioned by a minority in the 1800’s [and Lincoln and the Republicans were with only 39% of the popular vote] and even by some today. No way of ever escaping this agreement or contract if disfavor should set in amongst any of the participants? None of this matters, of course, as the sword is mightier than the pen, and Lincoln. Certainly proved it so.” (95-96) In this context, the authority of James Madison is conclusive:

“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.)

(For the federal nature of America’s republican government, and states’ rights being integral to federalism and limited government and to 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 those expressed by James Madison. See “Charters,” “Government of the United States,” and “Who Are the Best Keepers of the People’s Liberties? [on “republican” versus “antirepublican”],” 1792-1793, in Rakove, ed., *Madison: Writings*, 502-504, 508-509, 532-534. See more recently, Gary Rosen, *American Compact: James Madison and the Problem of Founding,* 1999 and Luigi, Marco Bassani, *Liberty, State, & Union: The Political Theory of Thomas Jefferson*, 2010.)

Between North and South, or rather between a minority Republican North versus a South and its Northern allies as a majority, “The U. S. Constitution was looked at in very distinct and different ways by the two sides in the struggle. One group [Lincoln and the Republicans] claimed the central Union government was supreme and all powerful above any and all the States, even though it was the States which had formed the Union. The other group insisted that the States were above the federal government except in areas where powers had been granted [expressly delegated] To the Union BY the States [not including any authority over slavery that had been reserved to the latter]! As the 1800’s [the 19th century] moved along, these two factions became more and more offensive and divisive toward each other, and the American government system degenerated into a power struggle [which section could control Congress and the presidency either to enact its political and economic agenda or to frustrate each other’s]. The centralized federal authority won as we all know, because the North had the most guns. That didn’t make them right, just more powerful.” (96) (On why the North won, by superiority of resources, manpower, technology, and why the CSA lost, because of a lack of will and internal dissention, military experts remain divided. For summaries of both sides of the argument, See “Why Did the North Win the Civil War?,”

at [www.socialstudieshelp.com](http://www.socialstudieshelp.com) and Alan Farmer, “Why Was the Confederacy Defeated?, at [www.historytoday.com](http://www.historytoday.com). General Pickett’s comment that the “Yankees had something to do with it,” the final outcome” is echoed by Gary W. Gallagher’s research and writings. See his *The Union War* and *The Confederate Wa*r, 1997. )

Among many different names for the conflict of 1861-1865⎯”the American Civil War,” the War Between the States,” “the War of Northern Aggression,” and “the War for Southern Independence”⎯Mr. Gantt adds his own appellation of “Lincoln’s War.” A “civil war,” defined as one “between two facitons in the same country for control of the same government,” it was not. “The South only wanted to leave, not take over the federal government. Thus, there was nothing civil about this war or humane in the least . . . . Between the States? Perhaps, but several states were held in the war on the Union side by military occupation and martial law and had no opportunity to express their decision on having a war or not. Northern Aggression? If you call sending upwards of a million man army into the Southern states to commit genocide upon the populace, then yes. “Southern Independence? It certainly seems so to me. This was war more between the Southern states’ government and the Union [Republican party) government.” (93-94)

 It was “Lincoln’s War” because “The People [most] did not want a war. And so, the best name for the whole sordid affair is Lincoln’s War, plain and simple.” What is more, “Lincoln had the power from the day of his election, November 6, 1860, to totally prevent an outbreak of war, but he never considered such a path. Never! No peace talks, no truce, no step-back-and-see what could be done without fighting. He never permitted anyone of his administration to talk with Southern leaders as emissaries of a foreign government since he did not recognize the South as a nation. He said they were recalcitrant states. If so, then why could he not talk to the Southerners as American citizens which he said they were? Not once in office did Lincoln so much as suggest an attempt at peace regarding the issues dividing the two sections. He never made an effort to calm or end the hostilities between North and South, not even a temporary cease-fire, though he could have done so with just the snap of his fingers . . . . He sought the extermination, capitulation, and unconditional surrender of the South and the Southern people . . . .” (94) (Lincoln’s rejection of secession as a legitimate right of revolution, his view of Southern actions against the federal government as a “rebellion” and “treason,” and his refusal to avoid recognizing the CSA as an independent country, all flowed from his belief in an indestructible and irrevocable union that was much older than the States! This was not the view of the Founders by any means. Lincoln arrived at his conclusion of the union as absolute, beyond Andrew Jackson’s earlier pronouncement during the Nullification Crisis of 1828-1832, by a deliberate reinterpretation of the Declaration of 1776 to be both more about equality than independence and as the charter of a national government superior to the Constitution. All of this historical revisionism or myth-making occurred after the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. On Lincoln’s new views of the Declaration, see especially Brian R. Dirck, *Lincoln and the Constitution*, 2012. Supporting Spencer Gantt’s views above and this 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.) “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. For the changing nature of the union and liberty bewtween 1787 and 1861, and the North South conflict over the meaning of the Revolution and Constitution, see Paul Nagel, *One Nation lndivisible: The Union in American Thought, 1776-1861* (New York, 1964, 1971); Peter C. Hoffer, “The Constitutional Crisis and the Rise of a Nationalistic View of History in America, 1786-1788,” *New York History*, LII (1971), 305-323; and Kenneth M. Stampp, "The Concept of a Perpetual Union,” *Journal of American History*, 65 (June 1978), 5-33; David D. Van Tassel, *Recording America's Past: An Interpretation of the Development of Historical Studies in America, 1607-1884* (Chicago, 1960); Arthur Shaffer, *The Politics of History: Writing the History of the American Revolution* (Chicago, 1975); Michael Kammen, *A Season of Youth: The American Revolution and the American Imagination* (New York, 1975); Kammen, *Spheres of Liberty: Changing Perceptions of Liberty in American Culture* (Madison, Wis., 1986); Kammen, *A Machine That Would Go By Itself: The Constitution in American Culture* (New York, 1986); Kammen, *Sovereignty and Liberty: Constitutional Discourse in American Culture* (Madison, Wis., 1988); John Phillip Reid, *The Concept of Liberty in the Age of the American Revolution* (Chicago, 1988); Kammen, *Selvages and Biases: The Fabric of History in American Culture* (New York, 1987); and Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York, 1991); and David Hackett Fischer, *Liberty and freedom: A Visual History of America's* Founding Ideas (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). The "end of the republic" thesis is contained in Wood, "The Union of the States." See also Susan Mary- Grant, *North over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* (Lawrence, Kansas, 2000); Major Wilson, "Liberty and Union: An Analysis of Three Concepts Involved in the Nullification Controversy," *Journal of Southern History*, XXXIII (August, 1967), 331-355;; *Space, Time, and Freedom: The Quest for Nationality and the Irrepressible Conflict, 1815-1861*(Westport, Connecticut., 1974); and Barrett Wendell*, Liberty, Union and Democracy: The National Ideals of America* (New York, 1906).

 The development of a larger myth of Democracy by Northern historians and its acceptance by New South Southerners is the subject of the author's dissertation: "The Union of the States: Radical Whig -Republican Ideology and Its Influence upon the Nation and the South, 1776-1861" (University of South Carolina, 1978). The "northernizing of southern history" and the "nationalization of American history" is discussed by Grady McWhiney, "Historians as Southerners," *Continuity: A Journal of History*, 9(Fall, 1984), 1-31. See also George B. Tindall, "Mythology: A New Frontier in Southern History," in Frank E. Vandiver, ed., *The Idea of the South: Pursuit of a Central Theme* (Chicago, 1964). For the persistence of a Northern viewpoint in histories from 1861-1914, see Beale, "What Historians Have Said about the Civil War" and John David Smith, "The Nationalist Historians and the Continuance of the Abolitionist Tradition," in *A New Creed for the New South* (Westport, Conn., 1985). Beale's complaint about a northeastern monopoly in historical writing and reviewing is equally relevant here. See Allan D. Charles, "Howard K. Beale," in the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* (Detroit, 1983), XVII ("Twentieth Century Historians"), 32-38. Beale's statement that the conspiracy thesis or "devil theory" of Civil War causation "has two faces" is also worth remembering ("What Historians Have Said about the Civil War," 58-59).

 See also Marc Egnal’s explication of an “Idealistic” interpretation of the Civil War in *Clash of Extremes*, 4-5. “Many historians now affirm the traditional wisdom that slavery caused the Civil War. The North, led by the Republican Party, attacked the institution [of slavery], the South defended it, and war was the result.” For
“difficulties with this ‘idealistic’ interpretation, “ see ibid., 5-7. “The idealistic and celebratory character of American attitudes toward the history of the United States has deep roots.” (Paul D. Escott, *“What Shall We Do With the Negro?” Lincoln, White Racism, and Civil War America* (Charlottesville and London, 2009), xiii-xv quote on xiii.

Goldfield addresses the Northern conquest of the West during and after the Civil War in *America Aflame*, 5, 15, 105-112, 205-212, 444-454, and 517-522.

For American history myths, see Ray Raphael, *Founding Myths: Stories That Hide Our Patriotic Past* (New York, 2004); David Hackett Fischer, *Paul Revere’s Ride* (New York, 1994); Charles Warren, “Fourth of July Myths,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 3 (1945), 237-272, and Richard Shenkman’s series *"I Love Paul Revere Whether He Rode or Not"* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991) and *Legends, Lies & Cherished Myths of American History* (New York: William Morrow, 1989). Supplementing Shenkman are David Hackett Fischer, Paul Revere’s Ride (Oxford, UK and New York, 1994); James W. Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong* (New York, 1995); Irvin Molotsky, *The Flag, the Poet and the Song: The Story of the Star-Spangled Banner* (New York, 2001); Arnaldo Testi, *Capture the Flag: the Stars and Stripes in American History* (New York, 2003); Ray Raphael, *Founding Myths: Stories That Hide Our Patriotic Past* (New York, 2004); James W. Baker, *Thanksgiving: The Biography of an American Holiday* (Hanover, New Hampshire and London, 2009); Marla R. Miller, *Betsy Ross and the Making of America* (New York, 2010); Ray Raphael, *Constitutional Myths: What We Get Wrong and How To Get It Right* (New York, 2013); and Marc Ferris, *Star-Spangled Banner: the Unlikely Story of America’s National Anthem* (Baltimore, 2014). See also “Battles of Lexington and Concord” “Henry Wadsworth Longfellow,’ in David S. Kidder and Noan D. Oppenheim, *The Intellectual Devotional: American History* (New York, 2007), 37, 69. For Revere and many other myths, see further “America: Facts versus Fiction,” American Heroes Channel (Workaholic Productions, Encino, California, 2013). Many of these popular myths of the American past are of Northern origins. )

Back to *Slavery and Lincoln’s War*. What about Slavery? Wasn’t the war about abolition and black equality? No. Emancipation, both preliminary and official in 1862-1863, was first of all a war measure aimed at weakening the ability of the Confederacy to wage war. Secondly, it was a diplomatic maneuver with the goal of gaining European support and preventing foreign recognition of the CSA. Not that many slaves were freed either. “So it appears that Lincoln freed the slaves in the ten Southern states where the Lincoln government had no power or control, but did not free any slaves in the Border States where it did not. Any escaped slaves captured in the Northern States were promptly returned to their proper Union slave owners. Perhaps then Secretary of State William Seward said it best. ‘We show our sympathy with slavery by emancipating slaves where we cannot reach them, and holding them in bondage where we can set them free.’ The Proclamation was considered a aham by all, except possibly the few slaves who might haave even heard about it.” (140). (For one insightful look at the limits of emancipation, see V. Jacques Voegeli, “A Rejected Alternative: Union Policy and the Relocation of Southern ‘Contrabands’ at the Dawn of Emancipation,” *Journal of Southern History*, 69 [November 2003], 765-790. The rejected alternative was relocation of freed persons to the North!!! The plan to deal with freed slaves was to keep them down South after the war to become freedmen and loyal Republican voters to support Republican economic measures, i.e., higher tariff, transcontinental railroads, a national bank, and extensive land grants, that were finally enacted during the war when the South was out of the Union. More important, America’s experiment in “biracial” politics would take place on Southern soil alone!!)

Referring to Lincoln’s famous 1862 letter to Horace Greeley, about saving the union without freeing any slaves or doing so by freeing some of the slaves and not others, Mr. Gantt makes an important point. “This doesn’t sound like someone who was all that concerned about the plight of the slaves. And, he could have easily saved his union by not having his stupid war in the first place.” (141) True. Lincoln was not about preserving the Union, however. To do so would have meant compromising on the issue of slavery and accepting America as half-free and half-slave as it had been since 1776. It would also have meant acquiescing in peaceable secession. Far from preserving the Union, Lincoln and his party were very much about remaking it anew into the states united. A new birth of freedom was about a new nation without slavery. (In “[The Union War](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0674045629?ie=UTF8&tag=washpost-books-20&linkCode=xm2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=0674045629),” Gallagher is back to take issue with what has become the new conventional wisdom, that the North fought the war in order to achieve the emancipation of the slaves. While welcoming the post-civil-rights-era emphasis on “slavery, emancipation, and the actions of black people, unfairly marginalized for decades in writings about the conflict,” Gallagher makes a very strong case — in my view a virtually irrefutable one — that the overriding motive in the North was preservation of the Union. “Students and adults interested in the Civil War,” he writes, “are reluctant to believe that anyone would risk life or fortune for something as abstract as ‘the Union.’ A war to end slavery seems more compelling.” Indeed it does, but it embroiders historical truth in order to suit the cultural and ideological mood of the moment . . . . All this politically correct twaddle plays fast and loose with the facts. Gallagher makes a polite bow to those who spout it — “it is important to know how northern society dealt with race and gender and how it conceived of freedom, liberty, and opportunity” — but then closes the case: “simply describing the many ways in which wartime northerners fell short of later standards of acceptable thought and behavior yields little understanding.” Drawing on “letters, diaries, newspapers, books, broadsides, illustrative materials, and other evidence produced at the time,” he “seeks not to decide whether we like or dislike the Civil War generation but to *understand* them and their actions. ”What he finds, over and over again, is that in the North “the mass of loyal citizens equated “the Union” with “the Nation” and believed beyond question that it had to be defended and preserved: “It represented the cherished legacy of the founding generation, a democratic republic with a constitution that guaranteed political liberty and afforded individuals a chance to better themselves economically. From the perspective of loyal Americans, their republic stood as the only hope for democracy in a western world that had fallen more deeply into the stifling embrace of oligarchy since the failed European revolutions of the 1840s. Slaveholding aristocrats who established the Confederacy, believed untold unionists, posed a direct threat not only to the long-term success of the American republic but also to the broader future of democracy. Should armies of citizen-soldiers fail to restore the Union, forces of privilege on both sides of the Atlantic could pronounce ordinary people incapable of self-government and render irrelevant the military sacrifices and political genius of the Revolutionary fathers.” Review of Gary W. Gallagher, The Union War, 2011, by Jonathan Yardley, The *Washington Post*, April 15, 2011.)

Within the limits of 200 pages, Mr. Gantt mostly fulfills his purposes of explaining “the two great evils of slavery and Lincoln’s War.” (xiv) Supported by serious research on the part of many modern historians as noted, Gantt exposes the complicity of the world including black Africa in the exportation of black Africans to the Americas in the trans-Atlantic slave trade and then Northern complicity thereafter in perpetuating slavery in America during the colonial, early national, and antebellum eras. The South alone was not responsible for the origins of slavery in America. Nor was its racism unique since black prejudice thrived above the Mason-Dixon line in old New England, the Northwest, and later the farther West. Yankees as Puritans, abolitionists, and “free soilers” including Abraham Lincoln were no “racial egalitarians” either. When emancipation came, followed by the Thirteenth amendment of 1865, the abolition of slavery meant only the end of slavery as the legal ownership of humans as property. Full civil rights for freed persons was not a part of the Republican program after 1865.

On one substantial point, Mr. Gantt is absolutely incorrect. There was no thought about abolishing slavery at the Federal Convention of 1787. (See “The Last Good Chance,” 87-90) Immediate emancipation was unthinkable considering the large numbers of slaves involved and their geographical concentration in the South. There was Lord Dunmore’s War to remember during the War for Independence. In the late eighteenth century, The Enlightenment was not as enlightened as many have assumed and liberty was confined to a propertied elite of whites that denied suffrage to many other white males and all women besides the enslaved and free blacks. The Declaration of 1776 was, moreover, more about independence and justifying separation or secession from the British Empire than equal rights of all men. What all delegates agreed upon was an end to the international slave trade as the beginning of a long process of gradual emancipation! With the purpose of 1776 in mind,

The opportunity to begin government anew and create a republican and a limited one that also had to be federal as well as another means of limiting the scope of governmental authority. Having rejected a “national” government in the Federal Convention (beginning with the Great or Connecticut Compromise of July 16, 1787 that assured equal representation of the states in the Senate), slavery became a purely state issue to be resolved, for or against, as each state saw fit to do so. The end of slavery in America would be very gradual that also included expatriation or colonization back to Africa, personal manumission, and then dispersal or diffusion into the territories. Until Abraham Lincoln and the new Republican party of 1854-1860m America as a federal republic and a union of the states could co-exist as half slave and half free. It could because at the time there was no great paradox yet between freedom and slavery. The proportions slavery finally reached were determined by the extant slave population reproducing and enlarging itself and then its spread southward and westward with the plantation production of the new staple crop of cotton and “Natural Limits” to its cultivation above 36, 30’. (See Wood, “A Declaration of Independence Not Equality: Historians Tell the Truth About 776,” at [www.nullificationhistory.com](http://www.nullificationhistory.com). On this point, see also Pauline Maier, *American Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence,* 1997, which is definitive; E. S. Morgan, “Slavery and Freedom: The American Paradox,” *Journal of American History*, 59 [June1972], 5-29; *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia,* 1975; and Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America*, 1976, 1979.) May distinguishes among many Enlightenments, “Moderate,” “Skeptical,” and “Revolutionary,” and “Didactic.” Revolutionary era Americans were part of and influenced by the first. “It is hard to exaggerate the greatness of the achievement or the creativity, boldness, and good sense of the Founders. The Constitution reflects all the virtues of the Moderate Enlightenment.” On slavery, May quotes James Madison: “’Great as the evil is, a dismemberment of the union would be worse.’” However, “Well before 1789d the ideas of Locke and Newton [and English radical Whigs] were being radically reinterpreted” “Whatever is, is right,” would soon be challenged by more “revolutionary prophets” especially in France. Quotes from 99, 100-101.).

Whether slavery would have ended peaceably historians continue to disagree. One thing is certain, with the mechanical cotton picker of the 1930’s and modern herbicides and pesticides, the need for large numbers of field workers would have diminished thereafter. When Lincoln admitted that slavery would require another one hundred years to end, even after putting the nation once again on a course of ultimate extinction (that a manufactured “Slave Power” had reversed in the 1850’s), one has to wonder why a civil war as required at all? Then, again, “Lincoln’s War” was always about more than slavery! It was also about every thing else since slavery could not be divorced from other divisive issues. After 1865, slavery continued under different names, i.e., tenant farming and sharecropping because cotton became king again!! In the name of “free labor,” the new Freedmen’s Bureau and its agents were adamant on insisting that wage-labor contracts be negotiated. (On the many aspects of the slavery issue, see David M. Potter, *The South and the Sectional Conflict*, 1968; Wood, “John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, and the Declaration of Independence” at [www.nullificationhistory.com](http://www.nullificationhistory.com); Marc Egnal, *Clash of Extremes*; review of Gene Datel, *Cotton and Race*, in *The New Criterion*, 33 [October 2014], 16-21; and Jim Powell, *Greatest Emancipations: How the West Abolished Slavery*, 2008.)