




McDougal Littell

The AMERICANS



CHAPTER
10

THE UNION IN PERIL



Soldiers arrest abolitionist John Brown and his followers at the federal arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia (now West Virginia), 1859. Brown had hoped to steal weapons and use them to instigate a nationwide slave rebellion.



1850 Congress passes Compromise of 1850.

1850 California enters the Union.

1852 Franklin Pierce is elected president.

1852 Harriet Beecher Stowe publishes *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.



1854 Congress approves the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

1854 The Republican Party forms.

USA
WORLD

1850

1852


1854

1850 Taiping Rebellion in China begins.



1853 Crimean War begins.

1854 Charles Dickens's *Hard Times* is published.



INTERACT WITH HISTORY

The year is 1850. Across the United States a debate is raging, dividing North from South: Is slavery a property right, or is it a violation of liberty and human dignity? The future of the Union depends on compromise—but for many people on both sides, compromise is unacceptable.

How can the Union be saved?

Examine the Issues

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



RESEARCH LINKS [CLASSZONE.COM](https://www.classzone.com)

Visit the Chapter 10 links for more information about The Union in Peril.

1856 James Buchanan is elected president.

1857 The Supreme Court rules against Dred Scott.

1859 John Brown attacks the arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia.



1860 Abraham Lincoln is elected president.

1861 The Confederacy is formed.

1856

1858

1860



1858 The 13.5-ton bell, "Big Ben," is cast in Britain.

1859 Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* is published.

1861 Russian serfs emancipated by Czar Alexander II.



The Divisive Politics of Slavery

MAIN IDEA

The issue of slavery dominated U.S. politics in the early 1850s.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW

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

Terms & Names

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

One American's Story

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

A PERSONAL VOICE JOHN C. CALHOUN

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

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

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



▲ John C. Calhoun was vice-president under John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson. His last words were: “The South. The poor South.”

Differences Between North and South

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

INDUSTRY AND IMMIGRATION IN THE NORTH The North industrialized rapidly as factories turned out ever-increasing amounts of products, from textiles and sewing machines to farm equipment and guns. Railroads—with more than 20,000 miles of track laid during the 1850s—carried raw materials eastward and

manufactured goods and settlers westward. Small towns like Chicago matured into cities almost overnight, due to the sheer volume of goods and people arriving by railroad. Telegraph wires strung along the railroad tracks provided a network of instant communication for the North.

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

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

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

MAIN IDEA

Contrasting

A List three ways in which the North and the South differed in the mid 1800s.

History Through Architecture

GREEK REVIVAL ARCHITECTURE


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

SKILLBUILDER Interpreting Visual Sources

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

 **SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R23.**

Oak Alley Plantation, Louisiana ▼



Slavery in the Territories

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

THE WILMOT PROVISIO The Wilmot Proviso divided Congress along regional lines. Northerners, angry over the refusal of Southern congressmen to vote for

internal improvements, such as the building of canals and roads, supported the proviso. They also feared that adding slave territory would give slave states more members in Congress and deny economic opportunity to free workers.

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

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

Membership in House of Representatives		
Year	Members from Free States	Members from Slave States
1800	77	65
1810	105	81
1820	123	90
1830	142	100
1840	141	91
1850	144	90

Source: *Historical Statistics of the United States*

SKILLBUILDER Interpreting Charts

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

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Motives

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

A PERSONAL VOICE ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS

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

—quoted in *The Coming of the Civil War*

STATEHOOD FOR CALIFORNIA As a result of the gold rush, California had grown in population so quickly that it skipped the territorial phase of becoming a state. In late 1850, California held a constitutional convention, adopted a state constitution, elected a governor and a legislature, and applied to join the Union.

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

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

California’s admission to the Union in 1850 increased tensions between North and South.



MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Effects

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

The Senate Debates

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

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


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

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

MAIN IDEA

Comparing

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



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

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

3 John C. Calhoun opposed the compromise. He died two months after Clay proposed it.

On February 5, Clay defended his resolutions and begged both the North and the South to consider them thoughtfully. The alternative was disunion—and, in Clay’s opinion, quite possibly war.

A PERSONAL VOICE HENRY CLAY

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

—quoted in *Voices from the Civil War*

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

A PERSONAL VOICE DANIEL WEBSTER


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

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

The Compromise of 1850

Calhoun’s Goals

Calhoun believed strongly in states’ rights over federal power and held the interests of the slaveholding South as his highest priority. He had long believed that “the agitation of the subject of slavery would . . . end in disunion.” He blamed the sectional crisis on Northern abolitionists and argued that the South had “no concession or surrender to make” on the issue of slavery.




Terms of the Compromise

- California admitted as a free state
- Utah and New Mexico territories decide about slavery
- Texas-New Mexico boundary dispute resolved; Texas paid \$10 million by federal government.
- The sale of slaves banned in the District of Columbia. But slavery itself may continue there.
- Fugitive Slave Act required people in the free states to help capture and return escaped slaves.

Webster’s Goals

Webster had argued with Northern Whigs that slavery should not be extended into the territories. Upon hearing Calhoun’s threat of secession, he took to the Senate floor and endorsed Clay’s compromise “for the preservation of the Union. . . . a great, popular, constitutional government, guarded by legislation, by law, by judicature, and defended by the whole affections of the people.”



SKILLBUILDER Interpreting Charts

1. How did Calhoun and Webster disagree over states’ rights? 2. How did the compromise try to satisfy both sides?

Webster's speech became one of the most famous in the history of the Senate. Spectators packed the Senate chamber for the event.

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

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

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


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

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Effects

E What was the result of Douglas's unbundling of Clay's resolutions?

KEY PLAYER



STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS
1813–1861

Stephen A. Douglas's political cleverness, oratorical skill, and personal drive earned him the nickname the Little Giant—a reference to the fact that he stood only 5'4" tall.

Using his political skill, Douglas engineered the passage of the Compromise of 1850 when all of the efforts of senatorial warriors, such as Clay, had failed. Douglas later became the well-known opponent of Abraham Lincoln in both a senatorial and a presidential election.

Douglas had been a judge, and then served two terms in the House of Representatives before he was elected to the Senate. However, he never achieved his ultimate political goal: the presidency.

SECTION 1 ASSESSMENT

- 1. TERMS & NAMES** For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.
- Wilmot Proviso
 - secession
 - Compromise of 1850
 - popular sovereignty
 - Stephen A. Douglas
 - Millard Fillmore

MAIN IDEA

2. TAKING NOTES

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

Issue or Trend	North	South
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

How was each region affected by the issue or trend?

CRITICAL THINKING

3. HYPOTHESIZING

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

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

4. ANALYZING PRIMARY SOURCES

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

5. EVALUATING

Do you think the North or the South won more significant concessions in the Compromise of 1850? Explain your answer.



Protest, Resistance, and Violence

MAIN IDEA

Proslavery and antislavery factions disagreed over the treatment of fugitive slaves and the spread of slavery to the territories.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW

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

Terms & Names

- Fugitive Slave Act
- personal liberty laws
- Underground Railroad
- Harriet Tubman
- Harriet Beecher Stowe
- *Uncle Tom's Cabin*
- Kansas-Nebraska Act
- John Brown
- Bleeding Kansas

One American's Story

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

A PERSONAL VOICE CHARLOTTE FORTEN

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

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

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



▲ Charlotte Forten was the granddaughter of James Forten, a Philadelphia abolitionist who fought in the Revolutionary War.

Fugitive Slaves and the Underground Railroad

Burns's return to slavery followed the passage of the **Fugitive Slave Act**, which was a component of the Compromise of 1850. Many people were surprised by the harsh terms of the act. Under the law, alleged fugitives were not entitled to a trial by jury, despite the Sixth Amendment provision calling for a speedy and public jury trial and the right to counsel. Nor could fugitives testify on their own behalf.

A statement by a slave owner was all that was required to have a slave returned. Frederick Douglass bitterly summarized the situation.

A PERSONAL VOICE FREDERICK DOUGLASS

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

—quoted in *Voices from the Civil War*

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Effects

A What effect did the Fugitive Slave Act have on abolitionist feelings in the North?



The Union in Peril 311


KEY PLAYER



HARRIET BEECHER STOWE 1811–1896

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

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



without food for days at a time. Harry Grimes, a slave who ran away from North Carolina, described the difficulties of escaping to the North.

A PERSONAL VOICE HARRY GRIMES

“In the woods I lived on nothing. . . . I stayed in the hollow of a big poplar tree for seven months. . . . I suffered mighty bad with the cold and for something to eat. One time a snake come to the tree . . . and I took my axe and chopped him in two. It was . . . the poisonest kind of snake we have. While in the woods all my thoughts was how to get away to a free country.”

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

Once fugitive slaves reached the North, many elected to remain there and take their chances. (See map on p. 313.) Other fugitives continued their journey all the way to Canada to be completely out of reach of slave catchers. Meanwhile, a new abolitionist voice spoke out and brought slavery to the attention of a great many Americans. **B**

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN In 1852, ardent abolitionist **Harriet Beecher Stowe** published *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Stirring strong reactions from North and South alike, the novel became an instant bestseller. More than a million copies had sold by the middle of 1853.

The novel's plot was melodramatic and many of its characters were stereotypes, but *Uncle Tom's Cabin* delivered the message that slavery was not just a political contest, but also a great moral struggle. Readers tensed with excitement as the slave Eliza fled across the frozen Ohio River, clutching her infant son in her arms. They wept bitterly when Simon Legree, a wicked Northern slave owner who moved to the South, bought Uncle Tom and had him whipped to death.

In quick response, Northern abolitionists increased their protests against the Fugitive Slave Act, while Southerners criticized the book as an attack on the South as a whole. The furor over *Uncle Tom's Cabin* had barely begun to settle when a new controversy over slavery drew heated debate.

Tension in Kansas and Nebraska

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

◀ An abolitionist poster distributed in 1851

MAIN IDEA

Summarizing

B How did the Underground Railroad operate?

The Underground Railroad, 1850–1860



GEOGRAPHY SKILLBUILDER

- 1. Movement** What does this map tell you about the routes of the Underground Railroad?
- 2. Place** Name three cities that were destinations on the Underground Railroad.
- 3. Location** Why do you think these cities were destinations?

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

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

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

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

THE KANSAS-NEBRASKA ACT


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

Free and Slave States and Territories, 1820–1854

The Missouri Compromise, 1820–1821



The Compromise of 1850



The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854



GEOGRAPHY SKILLBUILDER

- Place** How did the number of slave states change between 1820 and 1854?
- Region** How did the Kansas-Nebraska Act affect the amount of land that was open to slavery?

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Issues

- 🗣️ Explain why popular sovereignty was so controversial.

90 percent of Southern congressmen voted for the bill. The bitterness spilled over into the general population, which deluged Congress with petitions both for and against the bill.

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

A PERSONAL VOICE STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

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

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


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

Violence Erupts in “Bleeding Kansas”

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

From both the North and the South, settlers poured into the Kansas Territory. Some were simply farmers in search of new land. Most were sent by emigrant aid societies, groups formed specifically to supply rifles, animals, seed, and farm equipment to antislavery migrants.

This organized party of Kansas-bound armed settlers was one of the groups known as “Free-State batteries.” ▶



By March 1855, Kansas had enough settlers to hold an election for a territorial legislature. However, thousands of “border ruffians” from the slave state of Missouri, led by Missouri senator David Atchison, crossed into Kansas with their revolvers cocked and voted illegally. They won a fraudulent majority for the proslavery candidates, who set up a government at Lecompton and promptly issued a series of proslavery acts. Furious over events in Lecompton, abolitionists organized a rival government in Topeka in fall 1855. **D**

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

“THE POTTAWATOMIE MASSACRE” The news from Lawrence soon reached **John Brown**, an abolitionist described by one historian as “a man made of the

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

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

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

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


Southerners applauded and showered Brooks with new canes, including one inscribed with the words, “Hit him again!” Northerners condemned the incident as yet

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Causes

D Why did Kansas become a center of controversy over the issue of slavery?

KEY PLAYER



JOHN BROWN
1800–1859

John Brown was a fiery idealist who believed that God had called on him to fight slavery. He was raised in a deeply religious anti-slavery family. Brown was never financially successful although he tried a variety of ventures, from farming to land speculation.

By 1849, Brown was living in the black community of North Elba, New York. He supported many abolitionist causes, such as David Walker’s *Appeal* and helped finance farms for fugitive slaves.

Brown became a powerful symbol of the moral issue of slavery in the North and reinforced the worst fears of the South. After a number of raids on proslavery settlers in Kansas and a raid on Harpers Ferry, Virginia, Brown was caught. He was hanged for treason in 1859.



MAIN IDEA

Summarizing

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

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

The widening gulf between the North and the South had far-reaching implications for party politics as well. The compromises that had been tried from the time of the Wilmot Proviso until the Kansas-Nebraska Act could not satisfy either the North or the South. The tensions that resulted led to new political alliances as well as to violence. As the two sections grew further apart, the old national parties were torn apart and new political parties emerged.

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

SECTION 2

ASSESSMENT


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

- Fugitive Slave Act
- Harriet Tubman
- *Uncle Tom's Cabin*
- John Brown
- personal liberty laws
- Harriet Beecher Stowe
- Kansas-Nebraska Act
- Bleeding Kansas
- Underground Railroad

MAIN IDEA

2. TAKING NOTES

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



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

CRITICAL THINKING

3. ANALYZING EFFECTS

Explain how *Uncle Tom's Cabin* affected the abolitionist cause. Use details from the section to support your answer.

4. ANALYZING ISSUES

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

5. SYNTHESIZING

Explain the concept of popular sovereignty and describe Northern and Southern reactions to it as a way of making decisions about slavery in the territories. Use evidence from the text to support your answer. **Think About:**

- Douglas's view on continued expansion
- Douglas and the Missouri Compromise
- the congressional balance of power



The Birth of the Republican Party

MAIN IDEA

In the mid-1850s, the issue of slavery and other factors split political parties and led to the birth of new ones.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW

The Republican and Democratic parties remain the major political forces in the United States today.

Terms & Names

- Franklin Pierce
- nativism
- Know-Nothing Party
- Free-Soil Party
- Republican Party
- Horace Greeley
- John C. Frémont
- James Buchanan

One American's Story

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

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

A PERSONAL VOICE HORACE GREELEY

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

—quoted in *The Coming of the Civil War*

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



▲ Horace Greeley founded the *New York Tribune* in 1841.

New Political Parties Emerge

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

SLAVERY DIVIDES WHIGS Divisions in the Whig Party widened in 1852 when General Winfield Scott became the Whig nominee for president. Scott owed his

nomination to Northern Whigs who opposed the Fugitive Slave Act and gave only lukewarm support to the Compromise of 1850. Southern Whigs, however, backed the compromise in order to appear both proslavery and pro-Union. Because of Scott's position, the Whig vote in the South fell from 50 percent in 1848, to 35 percent in 1852, handing the election to the Democratic candidate **Franklin Pierce**.

In 1854 the Kansas-Nebraska Act brought about the demise of the Whigs, who once again took opposing positions on legislation that involved the issue of slavery. Unable to agree on a national platform, the Southern faction splintered as its members looked for a proslavery, pro-Union party to join, while Whigs in the North sought a political alternative.

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

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

While the Democratic Party courted immigrant voters, nativists voted for Know-Nothing candidates. The Know-Nothing Party did surprisingly well at the polls in 1854. However, like the Whig Party, the Know-Nothings split over the issue of slavery in the territories. Southern Know-Nothings looked for another alternative to the Democrats. Meanwhile, Northern Know-Nothings began to edge toward the Republican Party. **A**



▲ The 1854 campaign banner for the Know-Nothing Party reflects its members' fear and resentment of immigrants.

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Causes

A What impact did the slavery issue have on the Democratic and Whig parties?

Antislavery Parties Form

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

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

THE FREE-SOILERS Many Northerners were Free-Soilers without being abolitionists. A number of Northern Free-Soilers supported laws prohibiting black settlement in their communities and denying blacks the right to vote. Free-Soilers objected to slavery's impact on free white workers in the wage-based labor force, upon which the North depended. Abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison considered the Free-Soil Party "a sign of discontent with things political . . . reaching for something better. . . . It is a party for keeping Free Soil and not for setting men free."

Major Political Parties 1850–1860		
Party	Established	Major Platform
Free-Soil	1848	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • anti extension of slavery • pro-labor
Know-Nothing	1854 (as American Party)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • anti-immigration • anti-Catholic
Whig	Organized 1834	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pro-business • divided on slavery
Republican	1854	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opposed expansion of slavery into territories
Democratic	1840 (The Democratic-Republican party adopted “Democratic Party” as official name)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • states’ rights • limited government • divided on slavery

SKILLBUILDER Interpreting Charts
 What issue is addressed by almost all the parties shown on the chart?

Free-Soilers detected a dangerous pattern in such events as the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. They were convinced that a conspiracy existed on the part of the “diabolical slave power” to spread slavery throughout the United States. Something or someone, according to the Free-Soilers, had to prevent this spread. **B**

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Motives

B Why did most Free-Soilers object to slavery?

REPUBLICAN PARTY In February 1854, at a school house in Ripon, Wisconsin, some discontented Northern Whigs held a meeting with antislavery Democrats and Free-Soilers to form a new political party. On July 6,


the new **Republican Party** was formally organized in Jackson, Michigan. Among its founders was **Horace Greeley**.

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

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

THE 1856 ELECTION The Republicans chose **John C. Frémont**, the famed “Pathfinder” who had mapped the Oregon Trail and led U.S. troops into California during the war with Mexico, as their candidate in 1856. The Know-Nothings split their allegiance, with Northerners endorsing Frémont and Southerners selecting former U.S. president Millard Fillmore. Although Fillmore had once been a Whig, for all practical purposes, the Whigs had now dissolved.

The Free-Soilers’ banner features John C. Frémont and calls for an end to the spread of “slave power” in the nation.



The Democrats nominated **James Buchanan** of Pennsylvania. Although he was a Northerner, most of his Washington friends were Southerners. Furthermore, as minister to Great Britain he had been out of the country during the disputes over the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854. Thus, he had antagonized neither the North nor the South. Buchanan was the only truly national candidate. To balance support between the North and the South, the Democrats chose John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky as Buchanan's running mate.


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

A PERSONAL VOICE P. J. SCRUGGS

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

—quoted in *The Coming of the Civil War*


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

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

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

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Effects

 Why was the election of 1856 so important to the growth of the Republican Party?

SECTION 3 ASSESSMENT


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

- Franklin Pierce
- Know-Nothing Party
- Republican Party
- John C. Frémont
- nativism
- Free-Soil Party
- Horace Greeley
- James Buchanan

MAIN IDEA

2. TAKING NOTES

Show how various events led to the growth of the Republican Party in the 1850s. Use a chart similar to the one below.



Which event was most important in the rise of the Republican Party?

CRITICAL THINKING

3. CONTRASTING

How did the attitudes toward slavery held by abolitionists, Free-Soilers, and Know-Nothings differ? Explain your answer. **Think About:**

- the ultimate goal of abolitionists
- the reason Free-Soilers objected to slavery
- what caused the split in the Know-Nothing Party

4. SYNTHESIZING

How did the way in which the Republican Party was formed indicate that the party stood a good chance at success?

5. ANALYZING ISSUES

Why might the newly formed Republican Party have chosen John C. Frémont as their first presidential candidate in 1856?

States' Rights

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

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

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



1787

▼ CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

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

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





1832

NULLIFICATION ▲

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

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






1860

◀ SOUTH CAROLINA'S SECESSION

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

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



1957

LITTLE ROCK CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL ▲

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

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

THINKING CRITICALLY

CONNECT TO HISTORY

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

CONNECT TO TODAY

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

 SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R22.

 RESEARCH LINKS [CLASSZONE.COM](https://www.classzone.com)



Slavery and Secession

MAIN IDEA

A series of controversial events heightened the sectional conflict that brought the nation to the brink of war.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW

Secession created deep divisions in American society that persist to the present time.

Terms & Names

- Dred Scott
- Harpers Ferry
- Roger B. Taney
- Confederacy
- Abraham Lincoln
- Jefferson Davis
- Freeport Doctrine


One American's Story

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

A PERSONAL VOICE ABRAHAM LINCOLN

“A house divided against itself cannot stand.’ I believe this government cannot endure permanently half *slave* and half *free*. I do not expect the Union to be *dissolved*—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become *all one thing* or *all the other*. Either the *opponents* of slavery will arrest the further spread of it . . . or its *advocates* will push it forward, till it shall become alike lawful in *all* the States, *old* as well as *new*, *North* as well as *South*.”

—1858 speech



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

▲ This photograph shows Lincoln in about 1858, before the Civil War took its toll.

Slavery Dominates Politics

For strong leaders, slavery was a difficult issue. But it presented even more of a challenge for the indecisive President Buchanan, whose administration was plagued by slavery-related controversies. The first one arose on March 6, 1857.

DRED SCOTT DECISION In 1856 an important legal question came before the Supreme Court. The case concerned **Dred Scott**, a slave from Missouri. Scott's owner had taken him north of the Missouri Compromise line in 1834. For four years they had lived in free territory in Illinois and Wisconsin. Later they returned to Missouri, where Scott's owner died. Scott then began a lawsuit to gain his freedom. He claimed that he had become a free person by living in free territory for several years.


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

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

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

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

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



▲ Dred Scott's lawsuit dragged on for years, and set off even more controversy over slavery.

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Effects

A What was the significance of the *Dred Scott* decision?

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Motives

B Why did Buchanan support the Lecompton constitution?

Lincoln-Douglas Debates

That summer witnessed the start of one of Illinois's greatest political contests: the 1858 race for the U.S. Senate between Democratic incumbent Douglas and Republican challenger **Abraham Lincoln**. To many outsiders, it must have seemed like an uneven match. Douglas was a two-term senator with an outstanding record and a large campaign chest. Who was Lincoln?

A self-educated man with a dry wit, Lincoln was known locally as a successful lawyer and politician. Elected as a Whig to one term in Congress in 1846, he broke with his party after the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in 1854 and became a Republican two years later.

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

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

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

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


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

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

Popular sovereignty, Lincoln implied, was thus an empty phrase.

Douglas’s response to Lincoln’s question became later known as the **Freeport Doctrine**. Douglas contended, “Slavery cannot exist a day or

The Lincoln-Douglas debates created quite a spectacle, partly due to the opponents’ difference in height.



MAIN IDEA

Comparing

C Explain the similarities and differences between Lincoln's position on slavery and that of Douglas.

an hour anywhere, unless it is supported by local police regulations." If the people of a territory were Free-Soilers, he explained, then all they had to do was elect representatives who would not enforce slave property laws. In other words, regardless of theory or the Supreme Court's ruling, people could get around the *Dred Scott* decision.

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

Passions Ignite


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

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

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

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

JOHN BROWN'S HANGING On December 2, 1859, Brown was hanged for high treason in the presence of federal troops and a crowd of curious observers. Public reaction was immediate and intense. Although Lincoln and Douglas condemned Brown as a murderer, many other Northerners expressed admiration for him and for his cause. Bells tolled at the news of his execution, guns fired salutes, and huge crowds gathered to hear fiery speakers denounce the South. Some Northerners began to call Brown a martyr for the sacred cause of freedom.



POLITICAL DEBATES

In the mid-19th century, people flocked to public grandstands, where the political candidates debated the issues of the day.

When Lincoln debated Douglas, thousands of people came to listen. Each debate lasted for three hours, and listeners stood the entire time, interrupting the speakers with cheers and an occasional heckle. When the debate ended, spectators adjourned to tables of barbecued meat and ice cream. Torchlit parades ended the day.

The first televised presidential debate, in 1960, featured candidates Kennedy and Nixon. Since then, presidential candidates, including Bush and Gore (above), have made televised debating a cornerstone of presidential campaigning.

JOHN BROWN GOING TO HIS HANGING (1942)

This scene, painted by the African-American artist Horace Pippin in 1942, shows John Brown being transported by wagon to his execution. The artist has focused our attention on the cruelty of Brown's fate.

The abolitionist is shown tied with the rope that will be used to hang him, and sitting on the coffin that will receive his body after death. Brown's dark shape is silhouetted by the large white building behind him, a structure that combines the features of both courthouse and prison.

SKILLBUILDER


Interpreting Visual Sources

1. Why do you think the African-American woman in the right-hand corner is looking away from the scene?
2. How has the artist expressed the hopelessness of the situation?

 **SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R23.**




John Brown Going to His Hanging (1942), Horace Pippin. Oil on canvas, 24 1/8" x 30 1/4". Courtesy of the Museum of American Art of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. John Lambert Fund [1943.11]

The response was equally extreme in the South, where outraged mobs assaulted whites who were suspected of holding antislavery views. Harpers Ferry terrified Southern slaveholders, who were convinced the North was plotting slave uprisings everywhere. Even longtime supporters of the Union called for secession. As one former Unionist explained, "I am willing to take the chances of . . . disunion, sooner than submit any longer to Northern insolence and Northern outrage." 

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Effects

 Why did Harpers Ferry increase tensions between the North and the South?

Lincoln Is Elected President


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

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

The convention opened to a surging crowd of delegates, newsmen, and spectators. The 4,500-person delegate floor overflowed within minutes. To gain seating in the galleries, which were reserved for gentlemen who had come with ladies, determined single men even offered schoolgirls a quarter for their company. The first day of the convention was passed in forming committees, listening to prayers, and gossiping about politics. As events came to a close, campaign managers for the candidates retreated to their headquarters and began bargaining for delegates' votes, some working late into the night.

SEWARD AND LINCOLN Senator William H. Seward appeared to have everything one needed in order to be a successful presidential candidate: the credential of having led anti-slavery forces in Congress, the financial support of New York political organizations—and a desire to be the center of attention. In fact, Seward himself had little doubt that he would be nominated. Well before the voting took place, Seward drafted his senatorial resignation speech, which he planned to deliver when his nomination became official.

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



▲ Because Lincoln was virtually unknown in the East, his first name was written incorrectly as "Abram" on this 1860 election flag.

MAIN IDEA

Drawing Conclusions

E How did slavery affect U.S. political parties in 1860?

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

Analyzing Political Cartoons

"A POLITICAL RACE"


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

SKILLBUILDER

Analyzing Political Cartoons


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

 **SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R24.**



Presidential Election of 1860

Party	Candidate	Electoral votes	Popular votes
Republican	Abraham Lincoln	180	1,865,593
Southern Democratic	J.C. Breckinridge	72	848,356
Constitutional Union	John Bell	39	592,906
Northern Democratic	Stephen Douglas	12	1,382,713



GEOGRAPHY SKILLBUILDER

Region How did the election reflect the political divisions in the United States in 1860?

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

Southern Secession

Lincoln's victory convinced Southerners that they had lost their political voice in the national government. Fearful that Northern Republicans would submit the South to what noted Virginia agriculturist Edmund Ruffin called "the most complete subjection and political bondage," some Southern states decided to act. South Carolina led the way, seceding from the Union

on December 20, 1860. Four days later, the news reached William Tecumseh Sherman, superintendent of the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy. In utter dismay, Sherman poured out his fears for the South.

A PERSONAL VOICE WILLIAM TECUMSEH SHERMAN

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

—quoted in *None Died in Vain*

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

THE SHAPING OF THE CONFEDERACY On February 4, 1861, delegates from the secessionist states met in Montgomery, Alabama, where they formed the **Confederacy**, or Confederate States of America. The Confederate constitution closely resembled that of the United States. The most notable difference was that the Confederate constitution "protected and recognized" slavery in new

MAIN IDEA

Analyzing Effects

F How did Lincoln's election affect the South?



▲ This 1864 playing card bears the portrait of Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States of America.

territories. The new constitution also stressed that each state was to be “sovereign and independent,” a provision that would hamper efforts to unify the South.

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

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

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

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

HISTORICAL SPOTLIGHT

SECESSION AND THE BORDER STATES

Four slave states—Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and Delaware—were undecided about secession. Lincoln believed that these states would be essential to the success of the Union if war broke out. They had thriving industries and good access to important rail and water routes. Also, bordering North and South made the four states crucial to the movement of troops and supplies. Moreover, Maryland almost surrounded Washington, D.C., the seat of government.

As president, Lincoln faced a choice: free the slaves and make abolitionists happy, or ignore slavery for the moment to avoid alienating the border states. He chose the latter, but that did not prevent violent conflicts between secessionists and Unionists in Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri. With militia intervention, and some political maneuvering, Lincoln kept the four border states in the Union.

SECTION 4

ASSESSMENT

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

- Dred Scott
- Roger B. Taney

- Abraham Lincoln
- Freeport Doctrine

- Harpers Ferry
- Confederacy

- Jefferson Davis

MAIN IDEA

2. TAKING NOTES

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

Event	Result
1.	→
2.	→
3.	→

CRITICAL THINKING

3. CONTRASTING

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

4. EVALUATING

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

5. ANALYZING PRIMARY SOURCES

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

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

How did the Supreme Court decision add to the tensions over slavery in the 1850s?



DRED SCOTT v. SANDFORD (1857)

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

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


LEGAL REASONING

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

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

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

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



◀ Chief Justice Roger Taney

LEGAL SOURCES

U.S. CONSTITUTION

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

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

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

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

U.S. CONSTITUTION, FIFTH AMENDMENT (1791)

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

RELATED CASES

ABLEMAN v. BOOTH (1858)

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

WHY IT MATTERED

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


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

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

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

HISTORICAL IMPACT

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



▲ Contemporary newspaper article describing the *Dred Scott* case.

ments was expressly intended to nullify *Dred Scott*.

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

THINKING CRITICALLY

CONNECT TO HISTORY

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

 **SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R11.**


CONNECT TO TODAY

- 2. INTERNET ACTIVITY** [CLASSZONE.COM](https://www.classzone.com)

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

VISUAL SUMMARY

THE UNION IN PERIL



TERMS & NAMES

For each term below, write a sentence explaining its connection to the growing conflict in the 1850s.

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

MAIN IDEAS

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

The Divisive Politics of Slavery (pages 304–309)

- Describe the economic differences between the North and the South in the 1850s.
- What were the major terms of the Compromise of 1850?

Protest, Resistance, and Violence (pages 310–317)

- Discuss the impacts Harriet Tubman and Harriet Beecher Stowe had on antislavery attitudes in the North.
- What were the basic provisions and results of the Kansas-Nebraska Act?

The Birth of the Republican Party (pages 318–321)

- Why did the Republican Party grow as the Whig and Know-Nothing parties declined in the 1850s?
- Summarize the results of the election of 1856.

Slavery and Secession (pages 324–331)

- Compare and contrast Abraham Lincoln’s and Stephen A. Douglas’s views about slavery in the territories.
- Why was the South so upset by Lincoln’s election?

CRITICAL THINKING

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

KEY EVENT	FUEL FOR SECESSION
Wilmot Proviso of 1846	
Compromise of 1850	
Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854	
Election of 1860	


- DRAWING CONCLUSIONS** John Brown, Harriet Tubman, and Harriet Beecher Stowe all opposed slavery. Explain whether you consider any of these people to be heroes. Defend your viewpoint with references from the chapter.
- INTERPRETING MAPS** Review the map on page 313. Think about the terrain and bodies of water that an escaping slave would have faced. In what ways might these physical features have helped or hindered a fugitive’s progress?

Standardized Test Practice

Use the pie charts and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer question 1.

Use the quotation below and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer question 2.

Northern and Southern Resources, 1860



1. Which of the following statements is *not* supported by the pie charts?
- A The South was at a disadvantage in population.
 - B The South had no advantages over the North.
 - C The North held an advantage in the value of manufactured goods.
 - D The North and South had unequal resources.

“The State of Ohio is separated from Kentucky just by one river; on either side of it the soil is equally fertile, and the situation equally favourable, and yet everything is different. Here [on the Ohio side] a population devoured by feverish activity, trying every means to make its fortune. . . . There [on the Kentucky side] is a people which makes others work for it and shows little compassion, a people without energy, mettle or the spirit of enterprise. . . . These differences cannot be attributed to any other cause but slavery. It degrades the black population and enervates [saps the energy of] the white.”

—Alexis de Tocqueville, *Journey to America*

2. Why might an abolitionist in the 1850s have been eager to support de Tocqueville’s point of view?
- F to publicize the virtues of Ohio
 - G to persuade people to settle in Kansas
 - H to argue that slavery was bad for slave and master
 - J to show that immigrants don’t understand American traditions
3. The Wilmot Proviso failed to pass in the Senate because —
- A Northerners controlled the Senate.
 - B Southerners controlled the Senate.
 - C California was against it.
 - D Mexico was in support of it.

ADDITIONAL TEST PRACTICE, pages S1–S33.

 **TEST PRACTICE** CLASSZONE.COM

ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENT

1. **INTERACT WITH HISTORY** Recall your discussion of the question on page 303:

How can the Union be saved?

Now that you know more about the road leading to the secession crisis, would you change any of your responses? Write a plan of action in the voice of a presidential adviser.

2. **INTERNET ACTIVITY** CLASSZONE.COM

Visit the links for Chapter Assessment to find out more about John Brown and the raid at Harpers Ferry. Discuss one of the following questions in a short essay.

- How was John Brown regarded by abolitionists?
- Was John Brown’s plan destined to fail?