

Chapter 1 : Economic Causes to the Civil War - Essay

Economic and political ramifications of this acquisition played out and contributed to the American Civil War. Expansion of the American empire in the Pacific, Hawaii, and opening up of Japan also meant opening up of markets for American goods, especially cotton.

By the year of 1800, the North and the South was developed into extremely different sections. There was opposing social, economic, and political points of view, starting back into colonial periods, and it slowly drove the two regions farther in separate directions. The two sections tried to force its point of view on the nation as a whole. Even though negotiations had kept the Union together for many years, the condition was unstable. The presidential election of Abraham Lincoln was observed by the South as a risk to slavery and many believe it initiated the war. In the beginning of the 1800s, economic diversities between the two different regions had also grown. By the year 1800, cotton was the chief crop for the South; it also represented fifty-seven percent of all American exports. The North had confidently been recognized as a manufacturing society. Labor was needed, although not necessarily slave labor. Immigration was an encouragement. Immigrants that were from European regions worked in factories, built the railroads in the North, and developed the West. Very little stayed put in the South. The South opposed industrialization, so therefore they manufactured very little. Much of the manufactured supplies had to be traded in. Southerners therefore opposed high tariffs. The manufacturing financial system of the North, insisted high tariffs to defend its goods from inexpensive overseas competition. There were a small number of other supplies of income. The tariff paid for progress made by the federal government, for example: To maintain that tariffs were low, the South favored to do without these developments. The increasing Northwest Territory, which included the present-day Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota, was distant from the markets for its grain and cattle. The Northeast maintained most federally economic enhancement in the Northwest Territory. Even though both the South and the West were agricultural, the West linked itself with the Northern point of view. Economic requirements improved sectional differences, accumulating to the interregional opposition. Representative David Wilmot of Pennsylvania, an antislavery Democrat, introduced an amendment to the appropriation bill prohibiting slavery in any territory acquired from Mexico. The Wilmot Proviso passed the house but failed in the senate. Southern militants in the meantime contended that all Americans had equal rights in the new territories, including the right to move their slaves. The northwest sold most of its products to the residents of the northeast and was thus depended on eastern purchasing power. Eastern industry found an important market for its products in the west. In 1854, Senator Stephen A. Douglas initiated a bill to arrange the regions of Kansas and Nebraska, therefore opening these vicinities to white settlement. The Kansas-Nebraska Act canceled the Missouri Compromise and offered that settlers in the territories should choose "all questions pertaining to slavery. Because Kansas and Nebraska were north of the line recognized in the Missouri Compromise, the act was made probable that the addition

Chapter 2 : Causes of the Civil War: Political, Social, and Economic by Ron Burgundy on Prezi

civil war, economic causes of (issue) The economic roots of the Civil War reach almost to the beginning of English settlement in North America. The development of an economy based on the use of slave labor to produce staple crops through a plantation system in the South and a more diverse economy in the North based on free labor set the stage.

The History Learning Site, 25 Mar A common assumption to explain the cause of the American Civil War was that the North was no longer willing to tolerate slavery as being part of the fabric of US society and that the political power brokers in Washington were planning to abolish slavery throughout the Union. Therefore for many people slavery is the key issue to explain the causes of the American Civil War. By America could not be seen as being a homogenous society. Clearly defined areas could be identified that had different outlooks and different values. This was later to be seen in the North versus South divide that created the two sides in the war. The area relied on exports to markets in Western Europe and the class structure that could be found in the UK, for example, was mimicked in the southern states. Social advancement was possible but invariably it was done within the senior families of a state, who were the economic, political and legal brokers of their state on behalf of the people in that state. Within this structure was the wealth that these families had accrued. It cannot be denied that a huge part of this wealth came from the fact that the plantation owners oriented the work on their plantations around slave labour. As abhorrent as it may be to those in the C21st, slavery was simply seen as part of the southern way of life. When the dark clouds of war gathered in , many in the South saw their very way of life being threatened. Part of that was slavery but it was not the only part. The North The North was almost in complete contrast to the South. In the lead up to April , the North was industrialising at a very fast rate. Entrepreneurs were accepted and, in fact, were seen as being vital to the further industrial development of America. You did not have to stay in your social place and social mobility was common. For example, Samuel Colt was born in Connecticut into a relatively poor background. Whether he could have done this in the South is a moot topic. Cornelius Vanderbilt is another example. Whether a man who came from the Netherlands could have forced his way into the social hierarchy of the South is again a question open to debate. The North was also a cosmopolitan mixture of nationalities and religions – far more so than the South. There can be little doubt that there were important groups in the North that were anti-slavery and wanted its abolition throughout the Union. While they had their freedom and were paid, their lifestyle was at best very harsh. While the two sides that made up the American Civil War were apart in many areas, it became worse when the perception in the South was that the North would try to impose its values on the South. In , South Carolina passed an act that declared that Federal tariff legislation of and could not be enforced onto states and that after February 1st the tariffs would not be recognised in the state. Congress pushed through the Force Bill that enabled the President to use military force to bring any state into line with regards to implementing Federal law. On this occasion the threat of military force worked. People in South Carolina vowed, however, it would be the last time. Slavery and the American Civil War It was now that slavery became mixed up with state rights – just how much power a state had compared to federal authority. State rights became intermingled with slavery. The key issue was whether slavery would be allowed in the newly created states that were joining the Union. Kansas was officially opened to settlement in and there was a rush to settle in the state between those who supported slavery and those who opposed it. However on January 29th , Kansas was admitted to the Union as a slave-free state. Many in the traditional slave states saw this as the first step towards abolishing slavery throughout the Union and thus the destruction of the southern way of life. When South Carolina seceded from the Union on December 20th , the first state to do so, it was a sign that the state no longer felt part of the United States of America and that America as an entity was being dominated by a federal government ensconced in the views of the North. Whether this was true or not, is not relevant as it was felt to be true by many South Carolinians. The secession of South Carolina pushed other southern states into doing the same. With such a background of distrust between most southern states and the government in Washington, it only needed one incident to set off a civil war and that occurred at Fort Sumter in April

Chapter 3 : American Civil War Causes of the American Civil War - History Learning Site

The economic causes of the civil war I have lately come to the opinion that slavery per se had nothing to do with starting the war, rather, economics is at the heart of the issue. The South was a voting bloc in the Congress and that was why slavery was opposed so ardently.

Civil War term papers Disclaimer: Free essays on Civil War posted on this site were donated by anonymous users and are provided for informational use only. The free Civil War research paper Causes Of The Civil War essay presented on this page should not be viewed as a sample of our on-line writing service. This war was one of the most destructive events in American history, costing more than , lives. It was thought to be one that helped shape the character of the American individual today. From the Northern point of view this war was seen as a revolution. This unfortunate war started as a result of many years of differences between the Union and the Confederacy. It erupted after many years of conflict building up between the two regions. Between the North and the South there lay deep economic, social and political differences, but it is important to understand that Slavery was the root of cause of these differences. Social Causes There were many factors that contributed to the onset of the Civil War. Socially, the North and the South were built on different standards. The South, or the Slave States, was a slave-based community that followed a class-based system. This system consisted of aristocracy, middle class and then slavery. Many depended on slaves and were accustomed to this way of life, which was hard to change. Plantation owners had slaves working for them, and those who could not afford to own slaves would work on their own farm. The North, or Free States, had more immigrants settling in its areas, where labour was needed, but not the labour of slaves. Therefore it had a more industrialized society where most people worked in factories, and did not follow a class system. The Northerners opposed to Slavery as an institution in the South, as the Confederate States were the only region in the world that still legalized the ownership of slaves. This angered the Southerners and threatened their way of life. The election of Abraham Lincoln, as president was viewed by the South as a threat to slavery. Economic Causes By time, economic differences also developed between the two regions. The Southern states were agrarian states, and depended on agriculture rather than industrialization. After the Cotton Gin was invented, it increased the need for slaves and made cotton the chief crop of the South. But by then, the North was prospering industrially. The North depended on factories and other industrialized businesses. For this reason many of the new immigrants settled north, while very few settled south. This allowed the North to grow industrially, while making the South more hostile towards them. The Confederacy resisted any kind of industrialization and manufactured as little as possible. Southern economy opposed high taxes, as manufacturing was limited. But the Northern states welcomed high taxes to protect its products from cheap foreign competition. As a result, the South preferred not to accept most improvements that were made by the federal government, such as roads and canals, in order to keep taxes low. Another major problem that occurred was the competition between the North and South for more land. Both regions wanted to expand socially and economically westwards. The South wanted more agrarian states, while the North wanted to be able to expand industrial-wise. Confederate states felt that more agrarian states would help protect their economy and society in the future. The Union also felt that expansion would help their future as an industrialized country. As competition grew between the two sides, unrest grew with it, eventually resulting in the Civil War. Political Causes Politically, the States were not any more united in their point of views. Expanding westwards did would not only help each side socially, and economically, but also politically. More Slave states meant there would be more Southerners will be involved in congress. But if there were more Free States, there would be more northern representation in congress. This caused continuous unrest between the two regions. Also, both the North and the South had different views on how the government should operate. The south wanted less government control, and more state freedom, while the North welcomed the central power of a government. The South viewed the election of Abraham Lincoln, as president, as a threat to slavery. To make matters worse, the South was determined to start its own nation, by electing its own president, Thomas Jefferson. It started calling for International recognition as a nation from France and Britain. The South was persistent in

becoming a separate country, but the North was not about to give up the South. Aftermath Eventually, the Civil War erupted. After four long years, the Union would win the War and the country would once again become united. There were many reasons why the North was able to overcome the South. Since Southern economy was agrarian, and they had very few factories, the value of manufactured goods was higher than crops by the start of the War. This made the North wealthier, helping it to produce ammunition and other warfare utilities. The South was poorer, do to the lack of money since cotton was no longer providing the income and had only a few sources for manufacturing goods. As a result they were always unequipped and could not keep up. The North had the ability to invent modern weapons while the South had to fight with older weapons. The North always had more people compared to the South who had fewer people. At war, the casualty rates were always equal, but the South suffered more because while the North could afford these loses, the South could not. The Civil War lasted longer than it was expected to. But, unfortunately, the War was inevitable due to the great gap between the North and South socially, economically and politically. In fact, due to these circumstances, if the South had won the War, the country would have probably been divided into two separate countries. As any war would have ended, the War ended with great losses to both sides. More Americans were killed in the Civil War than in all other American wars combined from the colonial period through the later phase of the Vietnam War. Apart from the number of deaths and casualties, the great loss of property and money, the country now needed to work together in order to rebuild what was lost. Emotionally, it would take long years for many people to overcome the consequences of the war. The war was followed by twelve years of Reconstruction, during which the North and South debated the future of black Americans and fought bitter political battles. Yet, there was a good outcome of this war. Slavery came to an end as a legal institution. But the war did not bring equal rights for blacks, they still had their own war to win until those rights would be achieved.

Chapter 4 : Economic causes of the Civil War | American Civil War Forums

"The Economic Consequences of the American Civil War," in The Political Economy of War and Peace, Murray Wolfson, ed., (Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers,). Conflict and Compromise: The Political Economy of Slavery, Emancipation, and the American Civil War.

What were the social political and economic effects of the Civil War? Politically I think changes were made to the US government, and several laws and acts were passed and such. The political results of the US Civil War, was the firm establishment of the Democratic Party dominating Southern elections for over years. Sectional tensions enshrined in the Constitution erupted into a brutal war that cost over , lives and cleaved a nation in two. Slavery was a root cause of the conflict, and while the Thirteenth Amendment ended the practice, race relations continued to dominate American politics and society well into the future. The war also increased American economic power until it rivaled, and then surpassed, that of all other countries. And following the war, Americans had a new sense of being a part of a single nation instead of a conglomerate of states with their own institutions and histories. The main cause of the Civil War was States Rights. The South was afraid that A. Lincoln would emancipate slaves, and they believed that the US President should not be making decisions like that. In order to fully understand the reasoning of the south, you have to step into their shoes. Back then the US was thought of much as we think of the UN, a group of nations or states that were united. So with that mentality, what would you do? The United States had a low upkeep of money after spending their currency on military material. This improved American freedom and the "bagels" improved manufacturing of candy, meat, etc. The political issues and economic issues are tied together. The major powers in Europe were all looking to expand and acquire as many colonies as they could. This was especially true in the Balkans, with several countries trying to control the area. What political economic and social factors led the North and South in different directions and ultimately towards the Civil War from ? There was the Fugitive Slave Law that required northerners to turn in any slave. This was a dilemma because the northerners had to choose from turning in the slaves, another human being, or to abide by the law. Another reason, was the fact that Lincoln was elected into presidency. His ideas clashed with those of so many of the southerners that they took this as a threat. But the biggest cause was the intuition of slavery. This made a rift in the north and the south. The south heavily relied on the slaves to do their labor. They insisted that it was their god given right, showing passages from the bible to make their point.

Chapter 5 : Causes Of American Civil War Essay Example: What Caused The Civil War?

The Causes of the American Civil War Essay Example. The American Civil War of was fought between the Union (the northern states) and The Confederates (the southern states) under the presidency of Abraham Lincoln.

Although a minority of free Southerners owned slaves, free Southerners of all classes nevertheless defended the institution of slavery [37] as "threatened by the rise of free labor abolitionist movements in the Northern states" as the cornerstone of their social order. In there were around 4 million, slaveholders in a total free Southern population of about six million. Among slaveholders, the concentration of slave ownership was unevenly distributed. Perhaps around 7 percent of slaveholders owned roughly three-quarters of the slave population. The largest slaveholders, generally owners of large plantations, represented the top stratum of Southern society. They benefited from economies of scale and needed large numbers of slaves on big plantations to produce cotton, a highly profitable labor-intensive crop. Yet poor whites and small farmers generally accepted the political leadership of the planter elite. Several factors helped explain why slavery was not under serious threat of internal collapse from any move for democratic change initiated from the South. First, given the opening of new territories in the West for white settlement, many non-slaveowners also perceived a possibility that they, too, might own slaves at some point in their life. Above, this famous photo of a slave, Gordon, deeply scarred from whipping by an overseer, was distributed by abolitionists to illustrate what they saw as the barbarism of Southern society. Second, small free farmers in the South often embraced racism, making them unlikely agents for internal democratic reforms in the South. White racism in the South was sustained by official systems of repression such as the "slave codes" and elaborate codes of speech, behavior, and social practices illustrating the subordination of blacks to whites. For example, the "slave patrols" were among the institutions bringing together southern whites of all classes in support of the prevailing economic and racial order. Serving as slave "patrollers" and "overseers" offered white southerners positions of power and honor. Slave "patrollers" and "overseers" also won prestige in their communities. Policing and punishing blacks who transgressed the regimentation of slave society was a valued community service in the South, where the fear of free blacks threatening law and order figured heavily in the public discourse of the period. Southern tradesmen often depended on the richest planters for steady work. Such dependency effectively deterred many white non-slaveholders from engaging in any political activity that was not in the interest of the large slaveholders. Furthermore, whites of varying social class, including poor whites and "plain folk" who worked outside or in the periphery of the market economy and therefore lacked any real economic interest in the defense of slavery might nonetheless be linked to elite planters through extensive kinship networks. Since inheritance in the South was often unequitable and generally favored eldest sons, it was not uncommon for a poor white person to be perhaps the first cousin of the richest plantation owner of his county and to share the same militant support of slavery as his richer relatives. Finally, there was no secret ballot at the time anywhere in the United States—this innovation did not become widespread in the U. For a typical white Southerner, this meant that so much as casting a ballot against the wishes of the establishment meant running the risk of being socially ostracized. Increasingly dependent on the North for manufactured goods, for commercial services, and for loans, and increasingly cut off from the flourishing agricultural regions of the Northwest, they faced the prospects of a growing free labor and abolitionist movement in the North. Davis refutes the argument that Southern culture was different from that of Northern states or that it was a cause of the war, stating that "Socially and culturally the North and South were not much different. They prayed to the same deity, spoke the same language, shared the same ancestry, sang the same songs. National triumphs and catastrophes were shared by both. Slavery demarked not just their labor and economic situations, but power itself in the new republic. Southerners waged a vitriolic response to political change in the North. Slaveholding interests sought to uphold their constitutional rights in the territories and to maintain sufficient political strength to repulse "hostile" and "ruinous" legislation. Behind this shift was the growth of the cotton textile industry in the North and in Europe, which left slavery more important than ever to the Southern economy. They saw a vast growing abolitionist movement after the success of *The Liberator* in by William Lloyd Garrison. The fear was

a race war by blacks that would massacre whites especially in Black Belt counties where whites were a small minority. Searching for Biblical passages endorsing slavery and forming economic, sociological, historical and scientific arguments, slavery went from being a "necessary evil" to a "positive good". The First an Inferior Race: The Latter Its Normal Condition" setting out the arguments the title would suggest" was an attempt to apply scientific support to the Southern arguments in favor of race-based slavery. As industrial capitalism gained momentum in the North, Southern writers emphasized whatever aristocratic traits they valued but often did not practice in their own society: This supported their argument that slavery provided a more humane society than industrial labor. He advocated enslaving Northern factory workers, for their own benefit. Abraham Lincoln, on the other hand, denounced such Southern insinuations that Northern wage earners were fatally fixed in that condition for life. To Free Soilers, the stereotype of the South was one of a diametrically opposite, static society in which the slave system maintained an entrenched anti-democratic aristocracy. McPherson , exceptionalism applied not to the South but to the North after the North ended slavery and launched an industrial revolution that led to urbanization, which in turn led to increased education, which in its own turn gave ever-increasing strength to various reform movements but especially abolitionism. The Charleston Mercury read that on the issue of slavery the North and South "are not only two Peoples, but they are rival, hostile Peoples. We are not engaged in a Quixotic fight for the rights of man Nevins synthesized contending accounts emphasizing moral, cultural, social, ideological, political, and economic issues. In doing so, he brought the historical discussion back to an emphasis on social and cultural factors. Nevins pointed out that the North and the South were rapidly becoming two different peoples, a point made also by historian Avery Craven. At the root of these cultural differences was the problem of slavery, but fundamental assumptions, tastes, and cultural aims of the regions were diverging in other ways as well. More specifically, the North was rapidly modernizing in a manner threatening to the South. They fought to preserve their constitutional liberties against the perceived Northern threat to overthrow them. The ascension to power of the Republican Party, with its ideology of competitive, egalitarian free-labor capitalism, was a signal to the South that the Northern majority had turned irrevocably towards this frightening, revolutionary future. Watson has synthesized research on antebellum southern social, economic, and political history. Resultant "doubts and frustrations" provided fertile soil for the argument that southern rights and liberties were menaced by Black Republicanism. Thornton contends that Alabama was engulfed in a severe crisis long before Deeply held principles of freedom, equality, and autonomy, as expressed in Republican values appeared threatened, especially during the s, by the relentless expansion of market relations and commercial agriculture. Alabamians were thus, he judged, prepared to believe the worst once Lincoln was elected. Frederick Douglass The politicians of the s were acting in a society in which the traditional restraints that suppressed sectional conflict in the s and s" the most important of which being the stability of the two-party system" were being eroded as this rapid extension of democracy went forward in the North and South. Historians agree that political involvement was a larger concern to the average American in the s than today. Politics was, in one of its functions, a form of mass entertainment, a spectacle with rallies, parades, and colorful personalities. Leading politicians, moreover, often served as a focus for popular interests, aspirations, and values. By , they were mostly gone, and politics divided four ways. Republicans controlled most Northern states with a strong Democratic minority. The Democrats were split North and South and fielded two tickets in Southern non-Democrats tried different coalitions; most supported the Constitutional Union party in With the exception of South Carolina, whose convention election did not even offer the option of "no secession" but rather "no secession without the collaboration of other states", the Southern conventions were dominated by Unionists who voted down articles of secession. While an economic basis to the sectional crisis was popular among the "Progressive school" of historians from the s to the s, few professional historians now subscribe to this explanation. Craig, "In fact, numerous studies by economic historians over the past several decades reveal that economic conflict was not an inherent condition of North-South relations during the antebellum era and did not cause the Civil War. The three major attempts at compromise, the Crittenden Compromise , the Corwin Amendment and the Washington Peace Conference, addressed only the slavery-related issues of fugitive slave laws, personal liberty laws, slavery in the territories and interference with slavery within the existing slave

states. Huston emphasizes the role of slavery as an economic institution. Understanding the relations between wealth, slavery, and property rights in the South provides a powerful means of understanding southern political behavior leading to disunion. First, the size dimensions of slavery are important to comprehend, for slavery was a colossal institution. Second, the property rights argument was the ultimate defense of slavery, and white southerners and the proslavery radicals knew it. Third, the weak point in the protection of slavery by property rights was the federal government. Fourth, the intense need to preserve the sanctity of property rights in Africans led southern political leaders to demand the nationalization of slavery—the condition under which slaveholders would always be protected in their property holdings. Any chance that the South would industrialize was over. The South, Midwest, and Northeast had quite different economic structures. They traded with each other and each became more prosperous by staying in the Union, a point many businessmen made in 1850. Beard in the 1890s made a highly influential argument to the effect that these differences caused the war rather than slavery or constitutional debates. He saw the industrial Northeast forming a coalition with the agrarian Midwest against the Plantation South. Critics challenged his image of a unified Northeast and said that the region was in fact highly diverse with many different competing economic interests. In 1861, most business interests in the Northeast opposed war [citation needed]. After 1861, only a few mainstream historians accepted the Beard interpretation, though it was accepted by libertarian economists. By contrast, Southerners described free labor as "greasy mechanics, filthy operators, small-fisted farmers, and moonstruck theorists". Indeed, opposition to homestead laws was far more common in secessionist rhetoric than opposition to tariffs. After the American Revolution and the disestablishment of government-sponsored churches, the U.S. Without centralized church authorities, American Protestantism was heavily reliant on the Bible, which was read in the standard 19th-century Reformed hermeneutic of "common sense", literal interpretation as if the Bible were speaking directly about the modern American situation instead of events that occurred in a much different context, millennia ago. It was never denounced by Jesus, who made slavery a model of discipleship. Mk 10:65 The Apostle Paul supported slavery, counseling obedience to earthly masters Eph 6:6: Because slaves were to remain in their present state unless they could win their freedom 1 Cor 7:21: The abolitionist north had a difficult time matching the pro-slavery south passage for passage. For our purposes, it is important to realize that the South won this crucial contest with the North by using the prevailing hermeneutic, or method of interpretation, on which both sides agreed. So decisive was its triumph that the South mounted a vigorous counterattack on the abolitionists as infidels who had abandoned the plain words of Scripture for the secular ideology of the Enlightenment. The theological crisis occasioned by reasoning like [conservative Presbyterian theologian James H. Many Northern Bible-readers and not a few in the South felt that slavery was evil. They somehow knew the Bible supported them in that feeling. Yet when it came to using the Bible as it had been used with such success to evangelize and civilize the United States, the sacred page was snatched out of their hands. Trust in the Bible and reliance upon a Reformed, literal hermeneutic had created a crisis that only bullets, not arguments, could resolve. The question of the Bible and slavery in the era of the Civil War was never a simple question. The issue involved the American expression of a Reformed literal hermeneutic, the failure of hermeneutical alternatives to gain cultural authority, and the exercise of deeply entrenched intuitive racism, as well as the presence of Scripture as an authoritative religious book and slavery as an inherited social-economic relationship. The North—the forced to fight on unfriendly terrain that it had helped to create—the lost the exegetical war.

Chapter 6 : Political and Economic Causes of the American Civil War | Owlcation

ON ECONOMIC CAUSES OF CIVIL WAR The objective of rebellion is either to capture the state or to secede from it. In general, the incentive for rebellion is the product of the probability of victory and.

This is the major part of a lecture delivered in Orange County, California, in October. It was published by the Foundation for Economic Education in 1962. War is a primitive human institution. From time immemorial, men were eager to fight, to kill, and to rob one another. However, the acknowledgment of this fact does not lead to the conclusion that war is an indispensable form of interpersonal relations and that the endeavors to abolish war are against nature and therefore doomed to failure. We may, for the sake of argument, admit the militarist thesis that man is endowed with an innate instinct to fight and to destroy. However, it is not these instincts and primitive impulses that are the characteristic features of man. I do not want to dwell on the history of warfare. It is enough to mention that in the 18th century, on the eve of modern capitalism, the nature of war was very different from what it had been in the age of barbarism. People no longer fought one another with the aim of exterminating or enslaving the defeated. Wars were a tool of the political rulers and were fought with comparatively small armies of professional soldiers, mostly made up of mercenaries. The objective of warfare was to determine which dynasty should rule a country or a province. The greatest European wars of the 18th century were wars of royal succession, for example, the wars of the Spanish, Polish, Austrian, and finally the Bavarian successions. Ordinary people were more or less indifferent about the outcomes of these conflicts. They were not much concerned about the question of whether their ruling prince was a Habsburg or a Bourbon. Nevertheless, these continuous struggles placed a heavy burden upon mankind. They were a serious obstacle to the attempts to bring about greater prosperity. As a result, the philosophers and economists of the time turned their attention to the study of the causes of war. The result of their investigation was the following: Under a system of private ownership of the means of production and free enterprise, with the only function of government being to protect individuals against violent or fraudulent attacks on their lives, health, or property, it is immaterial for the citizens of any nation where the frontiers of their country are drawn. It is of no concern for anyone whether his country is big or small, and whether it conquers a province or not. The individual citizens do not derive any profit from the conquest of a territory. It is different with the princes or ruling aristocracies. They can increase their power and their tax revenues by expanding the size of their realms. They can profit from conquest. They are bellicose, while the citizenry is peace loving. Hence, the old liberals concluded, there would be no more wars under a system of economic laissez faire and popular government. Wars would become obsolete because the causes for war would disappear. Since these 18th- and 19th-century classical liberals were fully convinced that nothing could stop the movement toward economic freedom and political democracy, they were certain that mankind was on the eve of an age of undisturbed peace. What was needed to make the world safe for peace, they argued, was to implement economic freedom, free trade and goodwill among the nations, and popular government. I want to stress the importance of both of these requirements: The fateful error of our age has consisted in the fact that it dropped the first of these requirements, namely free trade, and emphasized only the second one, political democracy. In doing so, people ignored the fact that democracy cannot be permanently maintained when free enterprise, free trade, and economic freedom do not exist. President Woodrow Wilson was fully convinced that what was needed to make the world safe for peace was to make it safe for democracy. During the First World War it was believed that if only the German royal house of the Hohenzollern and the privileged German landed aristocracy, the Junkers, could be removed from power, a durable peace could be achieved. What President Wilson did not see was that within a world of growing government omnipotence this would not be enough. In such a world of growing government power, there exist economic causes of war. Does the Citizen Profit from Conquest? The eminent British pacifist, Sir Norman Angell, repeats again and again that the individual citizen cannot derive any profit from the conquest of a province by his own nation. This is quite correct. But that was in the days of classical liberalism and free enterprise. It is another thing in our day of government interference with business. Let us take an example. The governments of the rubber-producing countries have entered into a cartel

arrangement in order to monopolize the market for natural rubber. They have forced the planters to restrict production in order to raise the price of rubber far above the level it would have attained on a free market. This is not an exceptional case. Many vital and essential foodstuffs and raw materials have been subject to similar policies implemented by governments around the world. They have imposed compulsory cartelization on numerous industries, as a result of which their control was shifted away from private entrepreneurs to the hands of government. Some of these schemes, it is true, have failed. But the governments concerned have not abandoned their plans. They are eager to improve the methods applied and are confident that they will be more successful after the present Second World War. There is a lot of talk nowadays about the necessity for international planning. However, no planning, whether it be national or international, is required to make planters grow rubber, coffee, and any other commodity. They embark upon the production of these commodities because it is the most advantageous way for them to make a living. Planning in this connection always means government actions for the restraint of output and the establishment of monopoly prices. Under such conditions it is no longer true that a nation may not appear to derive a tangible profit from a victorious war. If the nations dependent on the importation of rubber, coffee, tin, cocoa, and other commodities could force the governments of the producing countries to abandon their monopolistic practices, they would improve the economic welfare of their citizens. To mention this state of affairs does not imply a justification for aggression and conquest. It only demonstrates how utterly mistaken are pacifists like Sir Norman Angell, who base their arguments in favor of peace on the unstated assumption that all nations are still committed to the principles of free enterprise. This party stands for the outright socialization of business. But the members of the Labour Party are too dull to realize what must be the economic and political consequences of the socialization of business. The Case of Germany I want to explain these consequences by referring, first of all, to the situation in Germany. Like all other European nations, Germany is poor in natural resources. It can neither feed nor clothe its population out of its own available domestic resources. Germans must import huge quantities of raw materials and foodstuffs, and must pay for these badly needed imports by exporting manufactures, most of which are produced out of those imported raw materials. Under free enterprise, Germany brilliantly adjusted itself to this circumstance. Its entrepreneurs succeeded extremely well in building up very efficient manufacturing plants. Its products triumphantly swept the world market. The Germans "all classes of the German population" became more prosperous from year to year. There was no reason to alter the structure of German business. But most of the German ideologists and political writers, the government-appointed professors and the socialist party leaders, as well as the government bureaucrats, did not like the free-market system. They disparaged it as capitalist, plutocratic, bourgeois, and as Western and Jewish. They lamented the fact that the free-enterprise system had incorporated Germany into the international division of labor. All these groups and political parties wanted to substitute government management of business for free enterprise. They wanted to do away with the profit motive. They wanted to nationalize business and to subordinate it to the commands of the government. This is a comparatively simple thing in a country that by and large can live in economic self-sufficiency. But it is different with Germany. Germany cannot eschew imports and consequently must export manufactures. This is precisely what a government bureaucracy can never achieve. Bureaucrats are only able to flourish in sheltered domestic markets. They are not fit to compete on foreign markets. Most people in Nazi Germany today want the government to control business. But the fact is that government control of business and foreign trade are incompatible. A socialist commonwealth must aim at autarky. This is where aggressive nationalism "once referred to as Pan-Germanism, and today called National Socialism" comes into the picture. We are a powerful nation, the National Socialists say; we are strong enough to crush all other nations. We must conquer all those countries whose resources are essential for our own economic well-being. We need autarky and therefore we must fight. We need Lebensraum living space and Nahrungs freiheit freedom from a scarcity of food. Both terms mean the same thing, the conquest of a territory so large and rich in natural resources that the Germans could live without any foreign trade at a standard of living not lower than that of any other nation. The term Lebensraum is fairly well known abroad. But the term Nahrungs freiheit is not. Freiheit means freedom; Nahrungs freiheit means freedom from a state of affairs under which Germany must import foodstuffs. It is the

only "freedom" that matters in the eyes of the Nazis. Both the Communists and the Nazis agree that the essence of what they mean by democracy, liberty, and popular government lies in the establishment of full government control of business. Whether one calls this system socialism or communism or planning is immaterial. Regardless of what it is called, this system requires economic self-sufficiency. But while Russia can, by and large, live in economic self-sufficiency, Germany cannot.

Chapter 7 : The Economics of the Civil War

Instead, the Civil War erupted from a variety of longstanding tensions and disagreements about American life and politics. For nearly a century, the people and politicians of the Northern and Southern states had been clashing over the issues that finally led to war: economic interests, cultural values, the power of the federal government to control the states, and, most importantly, slavery in.

The development of an economy based on the use of slave labor to produce staple crops through a plantation system in the South and a more diverse economy in the North based on free labor set the stage for the development of two economies within one country. Increasingly after the needs of these two economies were incompatible. Southern plantations focused initially on tobacco in Virginia, and later in Maryland and North Carolina, and rice, indigo, and livestock in South Carolina. Africans were the major source of labor after in the Chesapeake and the system of inherited life slavery developed in Virginia and Maryland by and quickly spread to the rest of the South. In South Carolina Africans were important not only as a source of labor but for their knowledge of cattle herding in the subtropical climate as well as their knowledge of the cultivation of rice. Tobacco was a crop that was hard on the soil, and from the beginning expansion into new land was an important part of the tobacco economy. Cotton appeared in the South as a decorative, novelty plant during the colonial era. But, it was well suited for the Southern climate, and the potential market for cotton began to expand dramatically as first Great Britain and then the United States began to industrialize in the eighteenth century. Large-scale cotton farming was not economically viable, however, because of the difficulties involved in separating the seeds from the fiber. The job was extremely labor intensive and the dark, oily seeds easily stained the fiber. In Eli Whitney invented a machine that separated the seeds and the fiber quickly and efficiently. Responding to the demand for cotton from the rapidly developing textile industry in both the U. Cotton, too, proved to be a hard crop on the soil and constant expansion into new lands became an essential part of the prosperity of the cotton culture. The northern economy had moved in a very different direction from the South. Northern climate and topography were ill suited for the use of slave labor and the system never became an essential part of the economy. New England quickly focused its energies on shipbuilding and mercantile shipping, fishing, finance, and other urban occupations. These industries thrived and led to the accumulation of capital that for investment in an increasingly diversified economy. In Pennsylvania there was a staple crop, wheat, but it was ill suited for slave labor. Pennsylvania also diversified its economy rapidly - processing its wheat into flour and developing its own merchant shipping industry. Throughout the northern colonies there were small-scale industrial operations, many of the using water power in traditional ways. While the South was constantly plowing its earned capital back into new land or additional labor, the North was accumulating capital that was invested in a wide variety of activities and northern investors were always looking for new areas in which to invest. Quickly the new industry spread through New England and the Mid Atlantic states. Within a generation steam power became widely available and industry was free to locate wherever there were raw materials and labor. While industrialization began with the textile industry, many other industries emerged. Increased demand led to major advances in the iron industry, including the development of new technology for making steel and the development of coal as a fuel to replace charcoal, first in making iron and steel and later in industry generally. The railroad and the steam boat brought steam power to transportation. The northern economy quickly became industrial during the first few decades of the nineteenth century, just as the South was becoming increasingly committed to cotton cultivation. The industrial economy attracted large numbers of people who sought work in the mills. Industrialists needed a reliable source of cheap food for this new industrial work force. The Midwest became the breadbasket of the industrial northeast, especially after the Erie Canal and, later, the railroad made it possible to move bulk cargoes east efficiently. The expansion of the industrial northeast required more and more territory for food—primarily wheat, corn, and beef. None of which were well suited to slave labor. These divergent economies were the basis for increasing sectional conflict over the territories in the West which both sections saw as essential to their continued development. The tariff caused sectional conflict prior to conflict over

territorial expansion. When Alexander Hamilton proposed the first tariff in it was not clearly a sectional issue. As the North industrialized, however, and the South became increasingly committed to cotton and other staple cultivation, the tariff was seen clearly as more beneficial to the North than the South. In response to large scale dumping of British manufactured goods in the United States after the War of 1812, Northern manufacturers pushed for higher and higher tariffs as protection. Southern opposition grew slowly at first, but accelerated rapidly after as tariff duties pushed higher. The tariff remained a long-standing bone of contention between North and South. For the North, tariffs protected its industries and jobs from foreign competition. For the South the tariff was little more than a transfer of wealth from them to the north through the higher prices for manufactured goods, both foreign and domestic. Thus they called the Tariff the "Tariff of Abominations. Led by John C. Calhoun, South Carolina nullified the Tariff of 1828. According to its southern advocates, if the leadership of a state found that it could not abide the imposition of a particular piece of legislation, it had the right to call a state convention and to "nullify" the act. This would take the act out of operation until Congress could debate the matter and add an amendment to the Constitution specifically allowing the act to become law. If this happened, the protesting state then had the right to peacefully secede from the Union. The nullification crisis came to a head when Congress passed a tariff increase in 1832. South Carolina nullified the law and tried to convince the other southern states to support its position. Even though the tariff issue produced the theory of nullification, opposition to the tariff was never as volatile as the issue of the expansion of the slave or the wage labor system into new territories and the formation of slave- or wage-labor states. This was because the creation of new states—slave or free states—was on the order of a foot-race between the competing labor systems. If the states adhering to one labor system became more numerous than the other, Congress could conceivably pass laws that would abolish the labor system of the less numerous block of states. This became the nightmare of the Republic. It was during the debate over the Missouri Compromise of 1820 that the nation confronted the whole issue of this equilibrium between slave and free states for the first time. This was the first limitation on slavery in the territories since the emergence of cotton as a major crop and the revitalization of slavery that had followed from that. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 had prohibited slavery north of the Ohio River, but it had been passed when the economic future of slavery was questionable and debate over the institution acceptable within the South. By the economic future of slavery appeared strong, provided new land for cotton could be brought into the system. The industrial economy of the North was attracting immigrants, while the South was not. The limitations on slavery that had been acceptable in 1820, when the populations of the two sections were more in balance and the economic potential of cotton still unclear, were no longer acceptable in the 1830s and 40s. Cotton had proven very profitable and the demand for slaves in cotton producing areas provided economic benefits to older southern states where slaves were bred for sale to these new areas to supplement income. The opposition between the North and South was becoming consolidated over more issues. Economically the slave economy needed as much room to expand as possible. Some southern leaders toyed with the idea of turning the Gulf of Mexico into a reserve for future slave states. The same thinking informed their view of expansion into the West. Balance was seen as necessary in the face of increasing opposition to slavery in the North on moral as well as economic grounds. As long as the number of slave states equaled the number of wage-labor states in the Senate, the South could block any Northern action to eliminate slavery. The North, however, was also increasingly unwilling to compromise on the expansion of slavery. A plentiful supply of cheap cotton was desirable, but the cotton textile industry was only one of a large number of expanding industries. A dependable source of cheap food was more important and the railroad would soon be allowing the development of territory ever further west. The Spanish had used slaves to mine silver back in the sixteenth century. Would the South employ slave labor in western mining? Southern opposition served as a brake on tariff increases and held up approval of subsidies for further expansion of the railroad system. But compromise with the South was increasingly unpopular in the North. In opposition to compromise with the South led to the formation of the Republican Party. Republicans represented the economic interests of the North and Mid-West, supporting higher tariffs, subsidies for railroad expansion, and uncompromising opposition to the expansion of slavery in the territories. The differences between the two sections over the tariff, railroad policy, and the expansion of slavery into the territories became more sharply

drawn with every election. The election of Republican Abraham Lincoln as president in on a platform that was entirely pledged to support northern economic needs convinced Southern states that secession was their only hope to preserve their economies. *The Road to Secession: A New Perspective on the Old South. The Impending Crisis* â€” Harper and Row, *Essays on the Background of the Civil War*. Oxford University Press, *A Nation on the Brink. Yankee Saints and Southern Sinners*. Louisiana State University Press, Cite this article Pick a style below, and copy the text for your bibliography. Retrieved November 11, from Encyclopedia. Then, copy and paste the text into your bibliography or works cited list. Because each style has its own formatting nuances that evolve over time and not all information is available for every reference entry or article, Encyclopedia.

Chapter 8 : Origins of the American Civil War - Wikipedia

According to economic historian Lee A. Craig, "In fact, numerous studies by economic historians over the past several decades reveal that economic conflict was not an inherent condition of North-South relations during the antebellum era and did not cause the Civil War."

Yeats wrote his short poem immediately following the catastrophe of World War I, but his thesis of a great, cataclysmic event is universal and timeless. It is probably safe to say that the original impetus of the Civil War was set in motion when a Dutch trader offloaded a cargo of African slaves at Jamestown, Va. Of course there were other things, too. For instance, by the eve of the Civil War the sectional argument had become so far advanced that a significant number of Southerners were convinced that Yankees, like Negroes, constituted an entirely different race of people from themselves. It is unclear who first put forth this curious interpretation of American history, but just as the great schism burst upon the scene it was subscribed to by no lesser Confederate luminaries than president Jefferson Davis himself and Admiral Raphael Semmes, of CSS Alabama fame, who asserted that the North was populated by descendants of the cold Puritan Roundheads of Oliver Cromwell—who had overthrown and executed the king of England in —while others of the class were forced to flee to Holland, where they also caused trouble, before finally settling at Plymouth Rock, Mass. How beliefs such as this came to pass in the years between and reveals the astonishing capacity of human nature to confound traditional a posteriori deduction in an effort to justify what had become by then largely unjustifiable. But there is blame enough for all to go around. From that first miserable boatload of Africans in Jamestown, slavery spread to all the settlements, and, after the Revolutionary War, was established by laws in the states. But by the turn of the 19th century, slavery was confined to the South, where the economy was almost exclusively agricultural. For a time it appeared the practice was on its way to extinction. Then along came Eli Whitney with his cotton gin, suddenly making it feasible to grow short-staple cotton that was fit for the great textile mills of England and France. But beneath this great wealth and prosperity, America seethed. Whenever you have two people—or peoples—joined in politics but doing diametrically opposing things, it is almost inevitable that at some point tensions and jealousies will break out. In the industrial North, there was a low, festering resentment that eight of the first 11 U. For their part, the agrarian Southerners harbored lingering umbrage over the internal improvements policy propagated by the national government, which sought to expand and develop roads, harbors, canals, etc. These were the first pangs of sectional dissension. Then there was the matter of the Tariff of Abominations, which became abominable for all concerned. This inflammatory piece of legislation, passed with the aid of Northern politicians, imposed a tax or duty on imported goods that caused practically everything purchased in the South to rise nearly half-again in price. This was because the South had become used to shipping its cotton to England and France and in return receiving boatloads of inexpensive European goods, including clothing made from its own cotton. However, as years went by, the North, particularly New England, had developed cotton mills of its own—as well as leather and harness manufactories, iron and steel mills, arms and munitions factories, potteries, furniture makers, silversmiths and so forth. And with the new tariff putting foreign goods out of financial reach, Southerners were forced to buy these products from the North at what they considered exorbitant costs. Smart money might have concluded it would be wise for the South to build its own cotton mills and its own manufactories, but its people were too attached to growing cotton. Later, South Carolina legislators acted on this assertion and defied the federal government to overrule them, lest the state secede. This set off the Nullification Crisis, which held in theory or wishful thinking that a state could nullify or ignore any federal law it held was not in its best interests. The crisis was defused only when President Andrew Jackson sent warships into Charleston Harbor—but it also marked the first time a Southern state had threatened to secede from the Union. Though the tariff question remained an open sore from its inception in right up to the Civil War, many modern historians have dismissed the impact it had on the growing rift between the two sections of the country. But any careful reading of newspapers, magazines or correspondence of the era indicates that here is where the feud began to fester into hatred. Some Southern historians in the past have argued this was the

root cause of the Civil War. Not only did the tariff issue raise for the first time the frightening specter of Southern secession, but it also seemed to have marked a mazy kind of dividing line in which the South vaguely started thinking of itself as a separate entity—perhaps even a separate country. All the resenting and seething naturally continued to spill over into politics. The North, with immigrants pouring in, vastly outnumbered the South in population and thus controlled the House of Representatives. That is until , when Missouri applied for statehood and anti-slavery forces insisted it must be free. That held the thing together for longer than it deserved. In plain acknowledgement that slavery was an offensive practice, Congress in banned the importation of African slaves. Nevertheless there were millions of slaves living in the South, and their population continued growing. Over the years this group became stronger and by the s had turned into a full-fledged movement, preaching abolition from pulpits and podiums throughout the North, publishing pamphlets and newspapers, and generally stirring up sentiments both fair and foul in the halls of Congress and elsewhere. At first the abolitionists concluded that the best solution was to send the slaves back to Africa, and they actually acquired land in what is now Liberia, returning a small colony of ex-bondsmen across the ocean. This did not sit well with the churchgoing Southerners, who were now subjected to being called unpleasant and scandalous names by Northerners they did not even know. This provoked, among other things, religious schisms, which in the mids caused the American Methodist and Baptist churches to split into Northern and Southern denominations. Somehow the Presbyterians hung together, but it was a strain, while the Episcopal church remained a Southern stronghold and firebrand bastion among the wealthy and planter classes. Catholics also maintained their solidarity, prompting cynics to suggest it was only because they owed their allegiance to the pope of Rome rather than to any state, country or ideal. Murderous slave revolts had occurred in Haiti, Jamaica and Louisiana and more recently resulted in the killing of nearly 60 whites during the Nat Turner slave uprising in Virginia in . That prompted an obscure congressman from Pennsylvania to submit an amendment to a Mexican War funding bill in that would have prevented slavery in any territory acquired from Mexico—which became known, after its author, as the Wilmot Proviso. In , to the consternation of Southerners, California was admitted into the Union as a free state—mainly because the Gold Rush miners did not want to find themselves in competition with slave labor. But for the first time it threw the balance of power in the Senate to the Northern states. By then national politics had become almost entirely sectional, a dangerous business, pitting North against South—and vice versa—in practically all matters, however remote. To assuage Southern fury at the admission of free California, Congress passed the Fugitive Slave Act of , which made Northerners personally responsible for the return of runaway slaves. Contrary to its intentions, the act actually galvanized Northern sentiments against slavery because it seemed to demand direct assent to, and personal complicity with, the practice of human bondage. During the decade of the s, crisis seemed to pile upon crisis as levels of anger turned to rage, and rage turned to violence. Northern passions were inflamed while furious Southerners dismissed the story en masse as an outrageously skewed and unfair portrayal. After the conflict began it was said that Lincoln, upon meeting Mrs. Douglas, overturned the Missouri Compromise and permitted settlers in the Kansas Territory to choose for themselves whether they wanted a free or slave state. Outraged Northern abolitionists, horrified at the notion of slavery spreading by popular sovereignty, began raising funds to send anti-slave settlers to Kansas. Equally outraged Southerners sent their own settlers, and a brutish group known as Border Ruffians from slaveholding Missouri went into Kansas to make trouble for the abolitionists. Into this unfortunate mix came an abolitionist fanatic named John Brown riding with his sons and gang. But during the Kansas controversy a confrontation between a senator and a congressman stood out as particularly shocking. By then, every respectable-sized city, North and South, had a half-dozen newspapers and even small towns had at least one or more; and the revolutionary new telegraph brought the latest news overnight or sooner. Throughout the North, the caning incident triggered profound indignation that was transformed into support for a new anti-slavery political party. In the election of , the new Republican Party ran explorer John C. In the U. Supreme Court delivered its infamous Dred Scott decision, which elated Southerners and enraged Northerners. The raid was thwarted by U. It simply reinforced the Southern conviction that Northerners were out to destroy their way of life. The s drew to a close in near social convulsion and the established political parties began to break apart—always a dangerous sign. The Whigs

simply vanished into other parties; the Democrats split into Northern and Southern contingents, each with its own slate of candidates. A Constitutional Union party also appeared, looking for votes from moderates in the Border States. As a practical matter, all of this assured a victory for the Republican candidate, Abraham Lincoln, who was widely, if wrongly, viewed in the South as a rabid abolitionist. With the vote split four ways, Lincoln and the Republicans swept into power in November, gaining a majority of the Electoral College, but only a 40 percent plurality of the popular vote. In short order, always pugnacious South Carolina voted to secede from the Union, followed by six other Deep South states that were invested heavily in cotton. Much of the Southern apprehension and ire that Lincoln would free the slaves was misplaced. No matter how distasteful he found the practice of slavery, the overarching philosophy that drove Lincoln was a hard pragmatism that did not include the forcible abolition of slavery by the federal government—for the simple reason that he could not envision any political way of accomplishing it. But Lincoln, like a considerable number of Northern people, was decidedly against allowing slavery to spread into new territories and states. By denying slaveholders the right to extend their boundaries, Lincoln would in effect also be weakening their power in Washington, and over time this would almost inevitably have resulted in the abolition of slavery, as sooner or later the land would have worn out. These influential journals, from Richmond to Charleston and myriad points in between, painted a sensational picture of Lincoln in words and cartoons as an arch-abolitionist—a kind of antichrist who would turn the slaves loose to rape, murder and pillage. For the most part, Southerners ate it up. If there is a case to be made on what caused the Civil War, the Southern press and its editors would be among the first in the dock. It goes a long way in explaining why only one in three Confederate soldiers were slaveholders, or came from slaveholding families. Interestingly, many if not most of the wealthiest Southerners were opposed to secession for the simple reason that they had the most to lose if it came to war and the war went badly. But in the end they, like practically everyone else, were swept along on the tide of anti-Washington, anti-abolition, anti-Northern and anti-Lincoln rhetoric. To a lesser extent, the Northern press must accept its share of blame for antagonizing Southerners by damning and lampooning them as brutal lash-wielding torturers and heartless family separators. With all this back and forth carrying on for at least the decade preceding war, by the time hostilities broke out, few either in the North or the South had much use for the other, and minds were set. One elderly Tennessean later expressed it this way: The long-term cause was a feeling by most Southerners that the interests of the two sections of the country had drifted apart, and were no longer mutual or worthwhile. There is the possibility that war might have been avoided, and a solution worked out, had there not been so much mistrust on the part of the South. Unfortunately, some of the mistrust was well earned in a bombastic fog of hatred, recrimination and outrageous statements and accusations on both sides. Put another way, it was well known that Lincoln was anti-slavery, but both during his campaign for office and after his election, he insisted it was never his intention to disturb slavery where it already existed. The South simply did not believe him. The Lincoln administration was able to quell secession movements in several Border States—Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland and what would become West Virginia—by a combination of politics and force, including suspension of the Bill of Rights. But when Lincoln ordered all states to contribute men for an army to suppress the rebellion South Carolina started by firing on Fort Sumter, Virginia, Arkansas, Tennessee and North Carolina also joined the Confederacy rather than make war on their fellow Southerners. Most thought it would be over by summertime. The Abolition of the Slave Trade William Wilberforce waged a long campaign to convince Britain to abolish the slave trade. By Claire Hopley John C. Calhoun -- genius pragmatist, and racist. The Union Must Stand: The outpouring of Civil War-era diaries and memoirs continues unabated. Fueled by the historiographical trend in recent years of examining the common

Articles 3.

Chapter 9 : Causes of the Civil War

This reconsideration of the Civil War by economic historians can be loosely grouped into four broad issues: the "economic" causes of the war; the "costs" of the war; the problem of financing the War; and a re-examination of the Hacker-Beard thesis that the War was a turning point in American economic history.

Contact Author White House, residence and office of the President of USA On the one hand, political and economic reasons were mutually exclusive; on the other hand, these were overlapping To the question "What were the political and economic causes of the civil war? Political causes One political reason was that the Confederate States of America also called South wanted each state more sovereign than the federation, or confederacy. This was demonstrated after the Confederacy was established in February Its constitution was almost an exact copy of the United States of America except for the sovereignty of state over the confederacy Geise, R. American History to This was also demonstrated in the structure of the army of the South. Each estate had its own army separate from the overall army commanded by President Jefferson Davis for 14 months then later on by Gen. Robert Lee for 13 months. Joseph Johnston who was defeated by Gen. Grant erected a siege. Lee could not get any reinforcement from any of the 11 states of the South, Gen. Johnston could not send a single soldier either because his army was engaged by Gen. In nine months of siege, when his soldiers laid prostrate and horses dropped off, Gen. Lee surrendered his army to Gen. Grant without the approval by President Davis on April 9, Another political reason was that the South wanted to protect their rights to own slaves. In the United States of America also called Union or North hired labor was already employed to work the farms. The increasing number of free blacks contributed to the political reasons. From 60, in the number of freed blacks increased to , in More than half of them lived in the South. However, their freedom was restricted by law and racial prejudice. Sometimes political rights were denied them. Restrictions in the North were less severe but there was also racial prejudice. Freed black and white immigrants fought for jobs. Violence owing to race usually arose in cities. Imperial expansion of the United States contributed to political reasons. More territory was welcome to slave owners. There was a move to purchase Cuba. New markets had to be found. President Filmore sent Commodore Mathew Perry to Japan in and scared the shogun with his black ships. Then Townsend Harris signed a trade treaty with Japan five years later. Disunity within the Whig and Democratic Parties arose over territorial expansion, impinging on slavery. The Southern cotton Whigs went over to the Democratic Party. The Northern conscience Whigs drifted to the Republican Party. The defeat of Mexico in the Mexican-American war in added one-third to the contiguous land territory of the United States. The decision of the Supreme Court on the case of Dred Scott in added fuel to the slavery issue. The Supreme Court ruled that a state has no right to prohibit slavery in a territory. In the senatorial campaign in Lincoln wanted to debate with incumbent senator Stephen Douglas on the sovereignty implications of the ruling. Lincoln made clear his anti-slavery position during the presidential campaign in The South threatened that if Lincoln won the election, they would secede from the Federation. Beauregard, of Fort Sumter of the North on April 12, Economic causes The North was economically dominant over the South. For example, by sheer territory. The South had 10 states while the North had 23 states. At the time of the establishment of the Confederacy, Texas was forced to join it that finally consisted of 11 states. Manufacturing was more robust in the North while the South fared better in agriculture like cotton farming. The trade balance was in favor of the North. The pro-secession states resisted taxation by the Federation. This was demonstrated concretely when the Confederacy finally came into being. Acquisition of new territory from Mexico added to the economy of the USA. However, it raised issues over slavery. Economic and political ramification of this acquisition played out and contributed to the American Civil War. Expansion of the American empire in the Pacific, Hawaii, and opening up of Japan also meant opening up of markets for American goods, especially cotton. This firmed up more the desire among the South to own slaves to work the cotton plantations. New entries as of September 9, The South believed that cotton would largely tip the balance in its favor. At that time the cotton factories in France and Britain got their raw material from the South. The thinking was that to keep their factories running, and largely their economies, France and Britain would intervene in the civil war to get their cotton supply. In

that case the American Civil war would turn into an international war. It would have been like the American revolution in the 1770s that started as a civil war in the British empire that turned into an international war owing to the intervention by France, Spain and The Netherlands. France landed an expeditionary force and engaged Britain in naval battles in American waters; Spain and The Netherlands stalemated Britain in the European seas. The prospect was that the North would be at war against the South, France and Britain with Russia remaining neutral or friendly to the North. So, cotton was an economic item that was employed as a political lever. The objective was to deprive the South of income to finance the war. However, the South mishandled the cotton strategy. It withheld exports, practically an embargo. It failed to see that Britain could resort to an alternative supply. It supported the growing of cotton in Egypt, according to fellow Huber Alastair Packer.