

8

THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR: 1860–1865

To understand this nation's history, you must understand the causes and effects of the American Civil War (1861-1865). One historian even referred to the Civil War as the "crossroads of our being." A study of U.S. history that minimizes the impact of that conflict would be similar to a study of human anatomy that downplays the role of the heart, making our knowledge of human anatomy, well, heartless.

KEY CONCEPTS

- Various tensions within and between regions came together to cause the Civil War.
- A fundamental disagreement between Northerners and Southerners about the Constitution contributed to the Civil War.
- Slavery became a crisis in the context of western expansion.
- Compromise on slavery, dating from the writing of the Constitution, became harder and eventually impossible by 1860.

The Civil War is discussed in depth in *The American Pageant*, 12th ed., Chapters 16, 18, and 19/11th ed., Chapters 17, 19, and 20.

Many social scientists view the Civil War as a watershed in American historical development, for it shaped the future of the nation in a number of ways:

- The war was a catalyst in the industrialization of the United States, and the industrial capitalist class became dominant.
- The federal government was deemed paramount in relation to the states.
- Race and class relations were profoundly affected by the war.
- The war further stimulated and accelerated industrialization.

- The war forever ended the institution of slavery.
- Asked about the causes of the Civil War, everyone talks about slavery. Of course, slavery was the fundamental cause, but there were other causes too. A deeper understanding of the Civil War reveals other tensions in this nation prior to the war, though all were in one way or another affected by the slavery issue. Some of these tensions came from regional differences, some from political differences.

AP Tip

There are usually numerous causes that explain why an event happened. Some are more important than others, but an understanding of the many causes will allow you to write a fuller free-response or DBQ essay, in addition to scoring well on the multiple-choice section of the AP exam. If you are explaining why the Civil War occurred, a response such as “To free the slaves” would be seriously inadequate.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

The types of economies that developed in the three regions of the United States in the first half of the nineteenth century had a powerful impact on political goals and decisions. The South grew important cash crops such as cotton, tobacco, sugar, and rice. The North was far more industrialized than the South or West, having shifted from mercantile capitalism. At the same time the West shifted from subsistence farming to commercial agriculture and produced more foodstuffs, such as corn and wheat, than the other two regions. The North came to rely more and more on western foodstuffs. In return, westerners became consumers of northern industrial and commercial products. By the 1850s the North and West were economically joined, and the North’s economy was rapidly evolving into a modern-day industrial and commercial system.

- Characteristics of the North’s Economy
 - banking
 - shipping
 - insurance
 - small and large business ownership—creating a middle, or bourgeois, class
 - some agriculture—both commercial and subsistence farming
 - availability of wage laborers
- Political Objectives of the North
 - a tariff, a tax on imports to protect the North’s growing industries
 - federal aid in the development of infrastructure—those things necessary for business to flourish, such as roads, canals, bridges, and railroads

- a loose immigration policy, which would provide cheap labor
- availability of free or cheap land in the West for settlement and investment opportunities, creating new markets for Northern manufactured goods
- the containment of slavery

In the South, cash crops such as rice and tobacco were grown extensively. Yet no commodity was more important to the South than cotton. One southern political leader was so certain that the rest of the nation depended on the South's cotton production that he declared, "Cotton is King!"

Cotton was one of the most important commodities in the world in the nineteenth century. Factories in the Northern states as well as European countries such as Britain and France needed cotton for their important textile industries. The most powerful producers of cotton in the South were the planter-slaveholders (owners of a hundred slaves or more, sometimes thousands). This class, a fraction of the entire Southern population, was politically, economically, and socially important. Some slaveholders owned only a few slaves. The majority of the Southern population was either subsistence farmers, who grew just enough food to sustain themselves, or yeoman farmers, who grew and sold surplus crops. As much as 25 percent of the South's white population owned slaves on the eve of the Civil War.

Many of the whites who owned no slaves resented the planter-slaveholding class. However, their fear of economic loss if slavery was abolished as well as their belief that whites are superior to blacks were powerful forces in maintaining the status quo. The planters made all of the political and economic decisions. Many nonslaveholders, with dreams of improving their lot and owning slaves, supported what many began calling the "peculiar institution." For most, however, preserving the planter-slaveholder's dominance of the South was not a reason to wage war.

- Characteristics of the South's Economy
 - dependent on the plantation system, the center of economic, political, cultural, and social life in the South
 - slave labor, the dominant labor force in the South producing the greatest value in the region
 - a majority of the white population engaged in subsistence farming
 - yeoman farmers, who owned small- or medium-sized commercial farms, a small proportion of the white population
 - a small urban bourgeois (or middle) class
- Political Objectives of the South
 - low tariffs because of the planter class's dependence on trade with Britain—cotton in return for consumer goods
 - the expansion of slavery for political, economic, and ideological reasons
 - opposition to a cheap public land policy, which would force the planter-slaveholder to compete politically,

economically, and ideologically with the independent farmer in the West

- make it far more difficult for the planter-slaveholder class to exert control over new territories
- expose poor whites and even slaves to the capitalist and democratic views expressed by Northern emigrants to the new territories

TENSIONS OVER POLITICAL THEORIES

Northerners believed in the *contract theory* of government, whereas Southerners believed in the *compact theory*. This explains why Southerners believed they had the right to secede from the Union and why Northerners were willing to prevent them from doing so. Here are the basic features of each theory:

THE COMPACT THEORY

- The states, not the people, created the national government.
- The laws of the states are supreme when in conflict with the laws and actions of the federal government. For example, in the antebellum North, personal liberty laws were passed to counteract federal fugitive slave laws.
- The states can declare the laws of the federal government null and void if they deem it necessary and appropriate.
- The logical conclusion of this theory if taken to its extreme is secession.

Examples of the compact theory include

- the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions (1798)
- the Hartford Convention (1815)
- *the South Carolina Exposition and Protest* (1828)
- the Ordinance of Nullification (1832)

THE CONTRACT THEORY

- The people, not the states, created the Union.
- The federal government is supreme.
- Thus, federal laws and actions take precedence over state laws and actions.

Examples of the contract theory include

- the various decisions made by the Marshall Court
- John Locke's *Second Treatise on Government*
- *Texas v. White* (1869)

ATTITUDES IN THE NORTH AND SOUTH

In the first half of the nineteenth century, many Northerners were content to allow slavery to reside in the Southern states. Only when Southern leaders sought to expand slavery did many Northerners

become concerned. Most Northerners, however, were not necessarily morally opposed to slavery. After all, the ancient Greeks and Romans owned slaves. Even the Bible seemed to justify its existence. Politically and economically, however, the expansion of slavery worried many Northern citizens and their political leaders. Did it matter if it spread to Kansas, Oregon, or California? Absolutely! Slavery was at the root of a social, economic, political, and cultural system that many Northerners disdained, partly because it was antithetical to the values of a vibrant, expanding capitalist system. Many Northerners tended to see the South as static. There was little social or economic mobility, little industry, and therefore few opportunities for wage laborers. For these reasons and because land was available out West, many immigrants avoided the South and settled in one of the other two regions.

Southern political leaders, on the other hand, ironically referred to Northern wage earners as “wage slaves.” To them, the North was a mess. Northern cities were congested, and workers earned poverty wages and worked and lived in dismal conditions. Southerners saw slavery as a paternalistic system that provided slaves with the basic needs of life. Furthermore, they argued, a slave was an investment; a Northern wage earner could be replaced. Although their owners often horribly mistreated slaves, Southern apologists claimed the opposite was true. Slaves, they maintained, were too valuable to mistreat. On the eve of the Civil War, a prime field slave could cost upward of \$2,000, a substantial sum of money in the mid-nineteenth century.

Containing slavery became important to Northerners, who believed that as slavery expanded, Northern industrial capitalism would be limited. In fact, a new political party emerged in the 1850s, the Republicans, whose political goals were “free labor, free soil, free men.” The industrial capitalists, owners of the North’s factories and workshops, had the most to gain by containing the spread of slavery and expanding capitalism. For example, as capitalism expanded, they hoped to expand the labor pool (by supporting a loose immigration policy), which in turn would drive down the wages they would have to pay to workers. Just as the planters dominated the South, the industrial capitalists profoundly influenced the North’s political, economic, and cultural system. What is more, their political and economic objectives often clashed with those of the South’s planter class. In the South, militant political leaders, referred to as fire-eaters, chafed at the notion of containing slavery, let alone abolishing it entirely.

Helping to shape the debate on the containment of slavery were the abolitionists, whose ranks were made up of whites and blacks. Unlike many who supported the containment of slavery—some of them racists—abolitionists sought to eliminate slavery. Some would simply free the slaves. Others, like Abraham Lincoln in the 1850s, sought to send freed slaves to Africa (the American Colonization Society). Whereas some abolitionists sought the gradual abolition of slavery, others (among them Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, Harriet Tubman, John Brown, and Sojourner Truth) favored an immediate end—peaceful or violent—to the institution.

AP Tip

A good way to organize your understanding of the causes of the war is to consider if the war was reconcilable or irreconcilable. In other words, could it have been prevented? The fact that it did happen does not mean that it had to happen. For example, some historians claim that a generation of bumbling politicians in the 1850s could not match the compromises reached by Clay, Calhoun, and Webster prior to 1850. Other historians contend that fire-eaters in the South and radical abolitionists in the North exacerbated the relationship between more moderate politicians, making compromise impossible. Still others argue that a dual civilization—the South based on a culture of slavery, the North on a culture of wage labor—could no longer be sustained under the same government. Lincoln may have had something like this in mind when he declared, “A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. It will become all one thing or all the other.”

THE BREAKDOWN OF COMPROMISE

Throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, various differences between the North and South were resolved. But the relationship deteriorated over the issue of territorial expansion. By 1860 all attempts at compromise failed, and within a year the nation was in the midst of the bloody Civil War that would cost over 600,000 Americans their lives. You need to understand the important decisions that shaped the political debate over such issues as the tariff and the expansion and containment of slavery. These include

- **The compromises at the Constitutional Convention** (See *The American Pageant*, 12th ed., Chapter 9.)
- **The Missouri Compromise (1820)** This was an attempt to maintain the balance in the Senate between slave and free states. In a compromise worked out by Senator Henry Clay, Maine entered the Union as a free state while Missouri came in as a slave state. Slavery north of latitude 36°30' was prohibited. War was averted for forty years and thus for a later generation to fight, but the damage to American nationalism helped to erode the so-called Era of Good Feelings.
- **The Nullification Crisis and the Compromise of 1833** In 1828 Congress passed a tariff that protected Northern industries but consequently drove up domestic prices. This new bill outraged Southerners, who began calling it the Tariff of Abominations. In particular, South Carolina, citing the doctrine of nullification, sought to challenge the new bill. The issue of nullification was eventually taken up in the Senate in the famous Webster-Hayne debate. When a new protective tariff was added in 1832, South Carolina, under the leadership of John C. Calhoun, its primary spokesperson and, at the time, vice president, voted to nullify the

new tariff. President Jackson, though an advocate of states' rights, threatened to invade South Carolina if its leaders refused to participate in the collection of tariff duties. He even threatened to "hang the first man of them I can get my hands on to the first tree I can find." (Jackson just may have done it.) After Calhoun's resignation, the crisis ended when Congress passed a bill that reduced the protective tariff the following year. No one was hanged, but South Carolina became the hotbed of southern dissent.

- **The Compromise of 1850** This crisis might never have occurred had, say, coal and not gold been discovered in California. By 1850 over 100,000 hoping-to-get-rich-quick settlers had poured into California, and it was not long before they asked that California be admitted into the Union as a free state. Though he was a slaveholder, President Taylor supported California's admission. Not surprisingly, southern fire-eaters threatened to pull their states out of the Union. Enter Henry Clay. His compromise, which was eventually signed into law by the new president, Millard Fillmore, included the following features:

- California would enter the Union as a free state.
- The more stringent Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 had guarantees that the law would be rigidly enforced.
- The slave trade, but not the ownership of slaves, was banned in Washington, D.C.
- The land taken from Mexico (Mexican Cession) would be divided into two new territories, New Mexico and Utah. Both territories would determine the status of slavery in their areas by *popular sovereignty*.

- **The Kansas-Nebraska Act (1854)** Senator Stephen A. Douglas (Illinois's "Little Giant") favored the passage of a bill that would route a major railroad line through Illinois (and consequently drive up the value of his own landholdings in the region). Even though this would stimulate the further settlement of the West, not everyone was convinced that the plan had merit. In order to get the bill passed, Douglas sought out Southern allies in Congress, and a deal was struck. Little did they know that their compromise, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, would touch off intense sectional hostilities. The features of the bill included the following:

- The Nebraska Territory would be divided into the Kansas and Nebraska territories.
- Settlers in those areas would determine the status of slavery—*popular sovereignty*.

Although the bill sounded reasonable to Southerners, it was the North's turn to be outraged. Both territories were located north of the 36°30' line, which the Missouri Compromise had closed to slavery. Still, the bill passed both houses of Congress and was signed by President Pierce. So angered were Northerners and Westerners by the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act that they began forming a political party that they hoped would take a stronger stand against the South's "slavocracy." Before long the Republican party was a major player in American politics.

- **The Dred Scott decision (1857)** The U.S. Supreme Court did not play a significant role in the conflict over slavery until Dred Scott compelled it to act. Scott was a slave who had been taken from

Missouri, a slave state, to Wisconsin, a free territory, by his owner. He resided there for two years until he was returned to Missouri. Scott sued for his freedom, contending that his residence in a free state made him a free citizen. Unfortunately for Scott, the chief justice of the Supreme Court was Roger Taney, a pro-Southern Democrat. Under Taney, the Court's ruling went well beyond the underlying principle of the case:

- Because Congress did not have the power to deny a citizen the right to his or her property without due process—and Scott, as a slave, was considered property—Congress could not prevent a slaveholder from taking his property to a free state. Thus the Missouri Compromise was invalid. There were now no limits to the potential expansion of slavery. Not satisfied with this decision, the court went further.
- The Constitution had not provided citizenship rights for blacks. Therefore, Scott had no constitutional right to sue his master in federal court.

The South was overjoyed by the Supreme Court's ruling. The North was outraged, again. Northern Democrats like Stephen Douglas found it increasingly difficult to reconcile their support of popular sovereignty with the *Dred Scott* decision. To more and more Northerners, the Republican party seemed to represent their views best. The Republicans were a coalition of:

- Free-Soilers, a political party formed in 1848 to represent western farmers by advocating a Homestead Law (cheap federal land for sale out West), internal improvements, and the containment of slavery
- Northern capitalists, who favored a high protective tariff, internal improvements, liberal immigration laws, and a sound money and banking system
- social reformers
- abolitionists
- Northern Democrats who felt betrayed by their party's support for the Kansas-Nebraska Act
- members of the Whig party who sought the containment of slavery
- various labor groups in the North

Democrat James Buchanan defeated the first Republican presidential candidate, John C. Frémont, in the 1856 election. In the 1860 presidential race, the Republican candidate, a tall, lanky former Illinois congressman called Abe by his friends, would fare much better, though his election would convince the South to secede.

THE ROAD TO WAR

A series of events in the late-1850s seemed to propel the nation to war:

- **"Bleeding Kansas"** This hostility in 1856 was a prelude to the full-scale war that would begin five years later. The conflict arose over whether Kansas would enter the Union as a free or slave state. (Keep in mind that the majority of antislavery forces in Kansas wanted to contain the spread of slavery, not end it.) Since popular

sovereignty would decide the issue, it seemed that the majority of Kansas's antislavery farmers would align Kansas with free states. Proslavery sympathizers in neighboring Missouri were not about to stand by while their neighbor cast its lot with the free states. Soon "border ruffians" crossed into Kansas with the intention of making it a slave state. In response, Northern opponents of slavery like the New England Emigrant Society began sending supporters to Kansas. Fighting soon erupted as advocates of slavery created a government in Lecompton, Kansas, and their opponents established an antislavery government in Topeka. Shortly thereafter, proslavery forces massacred citizens of the antislavery town of Lawrence. In retaliation, a violent abolitionist named John Brown organized his own massacre of proslavery advocates at Pottawatomie Creek. Democratic President Pierce's decision to remain aloof from the events in Kansas further damaged what was left of his party's cohesion. In the ensuing months it seemed as if Kansas would enter as a free state—that is, until the new president, James Buchanan, accepted the proslavery Lecompton Constitution, which would admit Kansas as a slave state. Some Democrats, Stephen Douglas among them, joined forces with Republicans in 1858 to oppose the Lecompton Constitution, and Kansas ultimately became a free state.

- **Lincoln-Douglas Debates (1858)** Having served only one term in the House, Lincoln challenged the nationally recognized Illinois senator Stephen Douglas in his campaign for reelection. Despite the fact that Lincoln lost the election, the debates thrust him into the national spotlight, for Lincoln had found a responsive chord with opponents of slavery. Although no abolitionist himself, Lincoln's rhetoric matched the sentiments of those who were opposed to the expansion of slavery as well as those who morally condemned it.
- **John Brown's Harpers Ferry Raid (1859)** John Brown's crusade to eradicate slavery was indeed noble, but his methods were violent. He believed that the planter-slaveholders who maintained a violent system of human ownership could be compelled to end slavery only through violent means. In what many consider a misguided attempt to start a slave rebellion, Brown and his supporters seized the federal arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia (now West Virginia). Hoping that slaves would flock to his cause and take up arms, Brown was instead met by U.S. Army troops under the command of Colonel Robert E. Lee. Captured and ultimately hanged, Brown became a martyr to many Northerners, which in turn made Southerners suspect that Northerners were involved in or at least supportive of violent slave rebellions.

Though many did not know it then, one more significant event would shatter the Union. A slave revolt? Another bloody conflict like the one in Kansas? No. It was a presidential election that led to secession and civil war. The election of 1860 showed just how divided the nation was. Four candidates sought the presidency:

- The Republican candidate was Abraham Lincoln, whose major political platform was the containment of slavery.
- The Democrats split between a Northern candidate and a Southern candidate. The former, Stephen A. Douglas, continued to advocate

popular sovereignty. The latter, John C. Breckinridge, opposed the containment of slavery.

- The Constitutional Unionists ran John Bell. His position was generally ambiguous, though preserving the Union seemed to be his primary goal.

Lincoln was elected despite the fact that he received only about 39 percent of the popular vote. In most Southern states his name did not even appear on the ballot. Because Lincoln was determined to stop the spread of slavery, South Carolina believed its future in the federal Union was threatened: more and more new free states would dramatically tip the balance in Congress in the North's favor. Shortly after Lincoln's election, South Carolina seceded from the United States, followed by six other Deep South states.

The new Southern government, called the Confederate States of America, elected Jefferson Davis, a former secretary of war and U.S. senator, as its president, with former U.S. Senator Alexander Stephens as vice president. The other Southern states waited to see if Lincoln would use force against South Carolina when he entered the White House in March 1861. In the meantime, the incumbent, James Buchanan, fretted and frowned, and did nothing.

Lincoln had to wait nearly half a year after his election to become president. During that time, Kentucky Senator John Crittenden proposed a compromise that would essentially return the nation to 1820 and the Missouri Compromise. This last-ditch attempt to prevent war failed as many Republicans, including Lincoln, believed the proposal would allow slavery to spread to the territories.

THE WAR

- The opening shots occurred on April 12, 1861, when Confederate shore batteries fired on Fort Sumter off the coast of Charleston, South Carolina, compelling the fort's commander to surrender. Although seen as a military victory in the South, it was a political victory for the Lincoln administration because the South had opened hostilities.
- Lincoln immediately called for 75,000 volunteers to suppress the rebellion, whereby four more Southern states seceded. The capital of the Confederacy was moved from Alabama to Richmond, Virginia.
- In what became known as the Trent Affair, a Union warship stopped and seized a British ship carrying Mason and Slidell, Confederate diplomats to Britain and France, and arrested the two. Lincoln was forced to release them for fear that Britain would declare war on the United States.

At the outbreak of hostilities, Lincoln had Confederate sympathizers arrested and in the process suspended the writ of habeas corpus, a fundamental legal right that requires the government to bring specific charges against the accused and prevents it from jailing an individual indefinitely. Justice Taney ruled that Lincoln had violated their civil rights and ordered them released.

Comparison of Union and Confederate Strengths and Weaknesses

Union	Confederate
Population: 22 million	<i>Population: 6 million whites</i>
<i>Had to conquer the South (offensive war)</i>	Defensive war
Considerably more factories, wealth; a much more diverse economy than the South's	<i>Economy is backward and underdeveloped; relies on overseas demand for cotton</i>
Strong central government (including A. Lincoln)	<i>New and weak central government</i>
Generals who understood the nature of "total war," such as Grant and Sherman	Initially better generals, such as Lee and Jackson

Initially the South was successful in waging war against the Union, in part because of the type of war—defensive—that the South was fighting. The Union military had the considerably more difficult task of capturing and holding major strategic areas. It had to conquer the South, whereas the Confederacy hoped that if the war dragged on, the Northern public would soon grow tired of "Lincoln's war" and sue for peace. The result of the war, however, was in large part ordained by the enormous population and industrial and transportation advantages of the North. To be sure, historians refer to other important factors such as better political leadership (Lincoln versus Davis). But as one Civil War historian put it, the North fought the war "with one hand tied behind its back." Below is a list of major military engagements. In general, the Union named battles after the nearest body of water (in italics) and the Confederates named them after the nearest town (roman).

- *First Bull Run*, 1861 (Manassas): Confederate victory
- Peninsula Campaign, 1862 (Seven Days): Confederate victory made possible by the brilliant leadership of Robert E. Lee
- *Second Bull Run*, 1862 (Manassas): Confederate victory
- *Antietam*, 1862 (Sharpsburg): Union victory. After a string of Union defeats, this victory, which turned back a Confederate invasion of the North, allowed Lincoln to issue the Emancipation Proclamation several months after the battle. This decreed that slaves living in those states that were in open rebellion against the United States would be forever free. The Emancipation Proclamation did not apply to the four Border States (Maryland, Missouri, Kentucky, and Delaware); for though they were slave states, they had not seceded. Lincoln had enough on his hands without inviting more states to take up arms against his government.
- Fredericksburg, 1862: Confederate victory
- *Monitor and Merrimac*, 1862: In order to break the Union blockade of Southern ports, which was designed to prevent the South from

exporting cotton and importing needed supplies (the Anaconda Plan), the Confederacy launched the *Merrimac*, an ironclad ship. The *Merrimac* proceeded to wreak havoc on the wooden Union blockade ships. But the North had not been idle in its development of an ironclad vessel. The North's ironclad, the *Monitor*, fought the *Merrimac* to a draw. The consequences of this famous naval battle were twofold: it rendered wooden fleets obsolete, and the Union, given its vast resources, began to build a fleet of ironclad warships, which it used to gain control of important waterways and defeat Confederate forts that guarded such important rivers as the Mississippi.

- Gettysburg, 1863: Union victory. Considered the most famous battle fought on North American soil, the defeat of the second and last major Confederate invasion of the North was the turning point of the war. The Confederates had reached their high-water mark, a point from which their fortunes steadily declined.
- Vicksburg, 1863: Union victory. This gave control of the Mississippi River to the North, effectively cutting the Confederacy in half.
- Sherman's "March to the Sea," 1864: Union victory. The Confederacy was again cut in half.
- Petersburg Campaign, 1864-1865: Union victory. Grant closed in on the Confederate capital.
- Appomattox Court House, 1865: Confederate General Lee surrendered to General Grant, effectively ending the war. Five days later, Lincoln was assassinated by a Confederate sympathizer, John Wilkes Booth.

IMPACT OF THE WAR

Both the North and the South were transformed dramatically by the war. Slavery was of course abolished (Thirteenth Amendment), the planter class was defeated, and the South quickly came under military rule. The war also marked the emergence of the United States as a nation-state. It was no longer a confederation of states—when his state seceded in 1861, Robert E. Lee resigned his commission in the U.S. Army because he could not take up arms against his "country," Virginia. The United States had become a federal union.

Even as it fought a major civil war, the North was changing. During the war it had passed a number of important acts, such as

- the Morrill Tariff of 1861, a high protective tariff
- the Homestead Act of 1862, leading to further development of the West
- the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, stimulating the growth and development of higher education
- a banking act that created (in 1863) the National Banking System
- a loose immigration law

The U.S. government also continued to develop the transcontinental railroad, further linking East and West, and it provided black Americans the opportunity to fight for their freedom as soldiers in the Union Army, which they did in considerable numbers—180,000.

Because of the application of industry and technology to warfare in the period 1861-1865, the Civil War is sometimes seen as the first modern war. The use of submarines, aerial reconnaissance, repeating rifles (an early form of machine gun), and ironclad ships is a short list of new technologies applied to waging that war. War also became considerably more personal and shocking with the extensive use of early photography in the Civil War. (The Crimean War, 1854-1856, was the first military conflict to be photographed, but it produced nowhere near the volume and graphic nature of pictures taken during the American Civil War.)

Extraordinarily, the North also held a democratic presidential election in the midst of the Civil War, despite the fact that the incumbent, Lincoln, seemed certain to lose. But he didn't. By late spring 1865, the American Civil War was over. But a new battle was looming, one that would attempt to combat racial injustice and shape the way Americans viewed their newly reunited nation.

Multiple-Choice Questions

- Which of the following is NOT an accurate statement regarding the North in the antebellum period?
 - Its industrial development was greater than the other two regions.
 - The textile industry was important to several of the states in this region.
 - The planter class was dominant in most of the states in the region.
 - Northerners favored a high protective tariff.
 - Much of the nation's banking industry was located in the North.

ANSWER: C. The planter class was the dominant social, economic, and political class in the antebellum South (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 302-306, 351/11th ed., pp. 311-314, 360).

- The turning point of the American Civil War occurred at the battle of
 - First Bull Run
 - Second Bull Run
 - Monitor* and *Merrimac*
 - Antietam
 - Gettysburg

ANSWER: E. Gettysburg. From this point on, though the South did win several important battles, it was greatly weakened (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., p. 462/11th ed., p. 472).

3. Which of the following is consistent with the contract theory?
- (A) *South Carolina Exposition*
 - (B) the political views of John C. Calhoun
 - (C) the states, not the federal government, are supreme
 - (D) the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions
 - (E) the decisions handed down by the Marshall Court

ANSWER: E. Answers A-D all support the alternative compact theory. In a number of important decisions, the Marshall Court strengthened the role of the federal government in relation to the states (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 218-219/11th ed., pp. 216-218).

4. The Compromise of 1850
- (A) banned slavery in Washington, D.C.
 - (B) allowed Kansas to enter as a slave state
 - (C) ended the Fugitive Slave law
 - (D) gave all of the land taken from Mexico to Texas
 - (E) allowed California to enter as a free state

ANSWER: E. California's entrance into the Union as a free state was a major concession of the South. The slave trade, not slavery, was banned in Washington, D.C. Kansas entered the Union as a free state. The Fugitive Slave Law was strengthened, not ended. The territory acquired from Mexico was divided into two territories, Utah and New Mexico (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 397-401/11th ed., pp. 407-410).

5. Popular sovereignty was the idea that
- (A) the government of each new territory should be elected by the people
 - (B) the American public should vote on whether to admit states with or without slavery
 - (C) it was for the citizens of a territory to decide if their territory would enter the Union as a slave state or a free state
 - (D) the United States should assume popular control of the territory acquired from Mexico
 - (E) slavery should be prohibited from any territory acquired by the United States

ANSWER: C. Popular sovereignty, an idea put forth by Lewis Cass as a means to compromise, gave citizens of a territory the right to decide on the status of slavery when joining the Union (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 390-391/11th ed., pp. 400-401).

6. In the *Dred Scott* decision, the Supreme Court
- (A) avoided controversy by ruling that Dred Scott had no right to sue in federal court
 - (B) ruled that the Kansas-Nebraska Act was unconstitutional
 - (C) ruled that Congress could not prohibit slavery in the territories because slaves were private property
 - (D) ruled that slaves could sue in federal court only if their masters allowed them to do so
 - (E) ruled that a slave that had been transported to a free state or territory was a free citizen of the United States

ANSWER: C. The Taney Supreme Court ruled that Scott, as a slave, was property that could be transported wherever his master decided to take him. The decision, highly controversial, invalidated the Missouri Compromise, not the Kansas-Nebraska Act (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 417-418/11th ed., pp. 427-428).

7. The Crittenden Proposal
- (A) forbade slavery west of the Mississippi River
 - (B) would have granted the Southern states their independence if they abolished slavery
 - (C) would have lowered the protective tariff in return for abolishing the Fugitive Slave Act
 - (D) ended the slave trade but not slavery in Washington, D.C.
 - (E) would have guaranteed slaveholders the right to own slaves south of the 36°30' line

ANSWER: E. This last-ditch attempt to forestall civil war would have, for all intents and purposes, returned the United States to 1820 and the Missouri Compromise (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 429-430/11th ed., pp. 438-439).

8. In the election of 1860
- (A) most Southerners refused to vote in protest against Lincoln's candidacy
 - (B) the majority of citizens living in the three sections voted for the Republican candidate
 - (C) the tariff was the most controversial issue
 - (D) the vast majority of southerners voted for the compromise candidate, John Bell
 - (E) the Republicans gained control of the executive branch for the first time

ANSWER: E. Lincoln, the first Republican to win the presidency, was elected with only 39 percent of the popular vote. Southerners did indeed vote, but primarily for Breckinridge. The tariff was not the most controversial issue in 1860, though it was still a point of tension between the North and South (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 429-430/11th ed., pp. 438-439).

9. The Emancipation Proclamation
- (A) abolished slavery in all states that were in open rebellion
 - (B) abolished slavery in the Border States
 - (C) ended the slave trade but not slavery
 - (D) was ruled unconstitutional by the Taney Supreme Court
 - (E) allowed for popular sovereignty in those states that willingly returned to the Union

ANSWER: A. Although controversial, the proclamation added another important moral and legal dimension to the Union cause by undermining slavery in those states that had seceded. It also made it morally difficult for France and Britain to provide aid to the Confederacy (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 458-460/11th ed., pp. 468-470).

10. Which of the following is NOT associated with the North during the war?
- (A) continued industrialization
 - (B) the Morrill Tariff of 1861
 - (C) the Homestead Act of 1862
 - (D) the use of blacks in the Union military
 - (E) the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment guaranteeing voting rights to male U.S. citizens

ANSWER: E. The Fifteenth Amendment was not ratified until 1870, fully five years after the end of the Civil War (*The American Pageant*, 12th ed., pp. 447-449, 488-489/11th ed., pp. 457-459, 497-498).

Free-Response Questions

1. Analyze the conflict between the industrial capitalist class and the Southern planter-slaveholding class. Discuss the following topics in your essay:
- economic differences
 - the expansion of slavery

RESPONSE When you are asked to analyze a topic or issue, you need to break it down into its fundamental aspects. In this question, the topics are selected for you. Identify and discuss economic differences—for example, the tariff—between the two classes. A discussion of the political objectives—in favor of the expansion or containment of slavery—as it relates to the interests of the industrial and capitalist class of the North and the planter-slaveholder class of the South should be your focus for the second part of the essay.

2. Analyze the following statement:
- The Civil War was the result of irreconcilable differences between the North and West on the one hand and the South on the other.

RESPONSE Keep in mind that this question is not asking you to support or refute the statement but to break down the various components of this particular perspective whether the differences leading to the Civil

War could have been reconciled. You may wish to discuss the divergent political and economic differences and disputes between the sections, as well as the ideological justifications each side utilized to defend its way of life. Another aspect of your discussion may include the view held by some historians that the North and the South had two incompatible civilizations that could not be sustained under one government, and thus they resorted to war to settle their economic and political differences.