Exploring America
Part 1
Columbus Through Reconstruction
A Time of Crisis

The intense national debate over slavery reached its peak in the 1850s. The stances that people in different sections of the country took regarding slavery increased the growing divisions in the Union. The Compromise of 1850 was an attempt to deal with some aspects of slavery, but it did not solve the central question. Violence erupted over slavery in Kansas and in John Brown’s raid on the military arsenal at Harpers Ferry. In the Bible study for this unit, we see what the New Testament says about how Christians should handle differences among believers.

Lesson 51 - Sectionalism
Lesson 52 - Trouble in the Territories
Lesson 53 - Twilight of the Giants
Lesson 54 - Stumbling Toward War
Lesson 55 - Bible Study: Differences
Memory Work
Memorize Psalm 133 by the end of this unit.

Books Used
The Bible
American Voices
Uncle Tom’s Cabin

Project (choose one)
1) Write 300 to 500 words on one of the following topics:
   - Would you have been an abolitionist, a defender of slavery, a compromiser, or would you have held some other position during the 1850s? Would you have been part of a church that endorsed slavery, opposed slavery, or said nothing about slavery? Write an essay on what you think would have been your position. Be honest with yourself.
   - Write a letter to someone explaining the way people do things where you live (either in your family or in your community, or both) and how those ways are different from the way others do those things. This can become a humorous piece, but do not be cruel or mean in what you say.

2) Make an audio recording or video of yourself singing or playing at least five spirituals sung by African American slaves during the 1800s.

3) Make an illustrated poster contrasting different, but equally acceptable, ways of living and doing things (such as types of houses, church practices, food, clothing, etc.). Your poster should include at least ten examples. Use the medium of your choice (e.g., collage, photography, drawing, painting, or pastels).
In the United States today, several factors bring our country together. The national media inform the entire country almost immediately about events happening around the nation. As radio and television reporters do this, they use basically the same accent and speech patterns. Just about wherever you go in America, you will likely find the same restaurants and stores. We still have regional speech patterns, and different parts of the country do have their distinctive attributes; but our interconnectedness as a country is much stronger than in the past.

By contrast, a significant aspect of American society before the Civil War was the reality of sectionalism. Even though the United States was one country, the different sections of the country had different social and economic patterns and different ways of looking at life in the U.S. These differences were a major factor in the country growing apart, especially over the issue of slavery.

America was diverse from its very beginning. The New England colonies, for instance, developed a different way of life from that known in the southern colonies. When settlers moved across the Appalachians, the West developed a different way of life from that in the East. As the country expanded to fill the continent, the people, lifestyles, and interests that made up the United States became ever more diverse.

My Way Is Best

Just as people can be ethnocentric about their own country in relation to other countries, Americans can be ethnocentric about their particular region of the country. Different habits and ways of life have developed in different parts of the country. People who live in each area tend to think that their own way of doing things is best and that any other way is strange and not quite as good.

These sectional differences can extend beyond mere manners and habits. People from different regions can become defensive about their own economic interests and way of life if they feel threatened by any proposed changes or by national laws that affect them adversely. It is this defensive sectionalism that developed in the United States and that eventually contributed to the breakup of the Union. The different sections of the country had long held conflicting views, but they were always advocated within the context of the Union. When loyalty to the Union was lost, the differences among the sections proved fatal for the nation.
The negative side of sectionalism appeared several times in American history before the Civil War. The compromises that were part of the formation of the Constitution involved balancing the interests of southern slave states and northern free states. Some New Englanders opposed the War of 1812 and talked of seceding from the Union. Many in the same region were against the Mexican War and again made noises about forming their own confederacy. South Carolina threatened secession during the Nullification Crisis of the early 1830s. Conflicts developed over the preferred route for the first transcontinental railroad. Debates over tariffs and internal improvements often reflected the conflicting interests of the different parts of the nation.

Americans before the Civil War were alike in significant ways. A large majority of Americans in all sections of the country lived on farms or in small towns. The country had a general consensus regarding religious beliefs and devotion to the Union. In other important ways, however, differences were emerging among the regions that eventually led to bitter conflict.

The South

The slaveholding states of the South had the most distinct and clearly stratified social system in the country. People were expected to know their place and stay there. In addition, the existence of and defense of slavery made for a life that was clearly different from how Americans in other sections lived.

The majority of southerners were small farmers. In North Carolina, for example, over seventy percent of farmers owned one hundred acres or less. Across the South, slaveowning families accounted for only about one-fourth of the population. In 1860 fewer than 11,000 planters owned fifty or more slaves. However, the plantation owners were the social and economic rulers of society. They made up only four percent of the adult white male population, but they owned over half of all slaves as well as the land that produced most of the cotton and tobacco and almost all of the region’s sugar and rice. In Alabama in 1850, slave owners made up thirty percent of the population but accounted for seventy percent of state legislators. Their personal interests influenced what these men saw as best for society.

The southern economy was driven by the plantation-owning interests. The South supplied most of the cotton for the rest of the world. Its biggest market was the British textile industry. Southern plantations also shipped cotton to the North for use in domestic textile mills. As slaves and land became more expensive, wealth was concentrated in even fewer hands.
The planter class fostered the southern aura of magnificent hospitality and a strict code of honor. Men were especially defensive about the honor of their families and womenfolk, and duels were common over the slightest perceived insult. Plantation wives were kept busy managing household affairs and domestic servants.

The southern middle class consisted of plantation overseers, small farmers (many of whom worked alongside any slaves that they owned), and skilled workers and shopkeepers. They lived in small houses, often a two-room cabin on a small farm. Although a minority owned slaves, the majority of the white population supported the institution of slavery. This support might have come partially out of fear of economic competition and social unrest if the slaves were freed. Lower class whites ("poor whites") lived in crude houses in mountainous regions or on land too poor for successful farming. They eked out an existence from season to season and were disdained by the rest of white society.

Black society in the South, both slave and free, was separate from white society. One-third of the population of the South was slaves. In South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi, slaves outnumbered whites. In 1860 a half million free blacks lived in the U.S., about evenly divided between North and South. Some became skilled craftsmen, such as blacksmiths, carpenters, or (like Frederick Douglass) shipbuilders.

Southern agriculture was diverse enough to support the region's food requirements. Corn was commonplace, and southern farms produced well over half of the nation's livestock. The downside of the cotton-based southern economy, however, was that it was dependent on outside factors for its continued success. Its cotton was shipped on vessels owned by northerners to mills in the North or in England. The South had few manufacturers, which made it dependent on outside industry. If the cotton markets slumped, the South got into economic trouble. The key word for the South was dependent.
The North, Midwest, and West

A key word to describe the North at the same time was diverse. Most northerners were still small farmers, but an increasing number were city dwellers. Many people worked in factories at low wages and were sometimes called wage slaves. However, workers did have the freedom to move and change jobs, a freedom that slaves did not have. The North had a much larger industrial base than the South. By 1860 northern factories made the U.S. the third largest manufacturing nation behind Great Britain and France.

The North had a larger population than the South because of high birth rates and the influx of immigrants. Immigration also brought an ethnic and cultural diversity to the North that was lacking in the South. Social classes existed in the North, but social and economic standing was less rigid than in the South.

In 1860 about one third of the U.S. population lived in the Midwest between Ohio and Iowa. This growing agricultural area was helped by the development of railroads. Texas, California, and other parts of the West were frontier areas that welcomed those with bold and adventurous spirits.

The illustration at right depicts the Weccacoep Engine Company responding to a fire in Philadelphia. Firefighter James Queen painted it around 1857. He also painted the image below of a factory.
The Impact of Sectionalism

The different economies and outlooks among the regions led to conflicts over national policies. Southern cotton growers, for instance, depended on trade with other countries and wanted low import tariffs to encourage it. Northern industrialists, on the other hand, wanted protection from overseas competition and thus favored high import tariffs. Westerners pushed for internal improvements such as roads, canals, and railroads to connect them to the East Coast; but southerners did not directly benefit from such projects and usually opposed them.

The other main issue that engendered sectional conflict was slavery. The conflict intensified over the question of extending slavery into the territories and into new states of the West. In the 1830s, the antislavery movement reached the U.S. House of Representatives. Several petitions were presented in Congress calling for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. Congress had the power to do this because it had oversight of the District.

Many of the petitions were introduced by Representative John Quincy Adams. In 1836 the House adopted a gag rule, which automatically tabled (i.e., killed) all such petitions. Members of the House, from both the South and the North, simply did not want to consider any Federal laws concerning slavery. Adams fought the rule as a denial of the people’s right to petition the government for redress of grievances, and the rule was eventually repealed in 1844.

The Wilmot Proviso

Sectional interests influenced the deliberations of Congress. In 1846 soon after the Mexican War began, President Polk requested $2 million from Congress to conduct negotiations with Mexico. Freshman Democratic Representative David Wilmot from Pennsylvania proposed an amendment to the appropriation request. The proposed amendment would require that slavery never be allowed in any territory that was gained by using the $2 million. His proposal was based on the provision of the Northwest Ordinance which banned slavery in that territory and in the states formed from it.

The Wilmot Proviso created hot debate in Congress. The untouchable topic had been brought up for discussion. The House passed the amendment, but the Senate rejected it. The same idea was introduced and voted on repeatedly, and it was always defeated. A little later, Senator John C. Calhoun of South Carolina proposed resolutions (which were never voted on) which said that the territories were owned by all the states, not the Federal government. All Americans, Calhoun said, had a right to take their possessions into all territories; thus, in his view, Congress had no right to forbid slavery in any territory.
Popular Sovereignty

The two positions by Wilmot and Calhoun outlined the debate over slavery for the next several years. Free-soilers wanted slavery excluded from the territories, while proslavery advocates insisted on the right of settlers to take slaves into whatever territory settlers wished, unimpeded by Congress. The most attractive-sounding middle ground was put forth by Michigan Democratic Senator Lewis Cass. He proposed that territories be organized on the basis of popular sovereignty (antislavery men called it squatter sovereignty). This idea held that the people living in a given territory should decide whether the territory would be slave or free.

This sounded fair and democratic, but Cass did not specify when such a determination was to be made. If the decision was made when an area became a territory, slavery could be banned fairly easily. However, Calhoun believed that this was unconstitutional since Congress did not have the right to ban slavery nor to give that right to territories. If the slave-or-free determination was made when a territory applied for statehood, then both proslavery and antislavery advocates had a fair chance of carrying the day. Many in both camps supported popular sovereignty as the best way for their point of view to be adopted. Popular sovereignty sounded good; but as we will see, the one time it was applied to organizing a territory it led to a disaster.

The debate over slavery tied up Congress for most of the period leading up to 1861. Even more, it caught up the nation in a continuing and increasingly heated discussion over what to do about the South’s peculiar institution.

Nathanael said to him, “Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?”
Philip said to him, “Come and see.”
John 1:46

* Assignments for Lesson 51 *

**Literature**  Continue reading *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. Plan to finish it by the end of this unit.

**Bible**  In the Bible study lesson for this unit we will discuss what the Bible says about handling our differences. Read Romans 12:3-13. List three good ways to handle the fact that we have differences, as described in this passage.

Start memorizing Psalm 133.

**Project**  Choose your project for this unit and start working on it.

**Student Review**  Optional: Answer the questions for Lesson 51.
John Sutter was born in Germany in 1803. He came to the United States in 1834 and eventually settled in the Sacramento Valley of California, which at the time was a province of Mexico. Sutter was given a 49,000 acre land grant and became a Mexican citizen. His colony attracted many settlers, including a good number of Americans.

When a group of Americans declared California to be independent of Mexico in 1846, Sutter sided with the Americans. After California was annexed to the U.S., Sutter began construction of a new sawmill on his property. On January 24, 1848, workers excavating for the mill discovered gold. After President James K. Polk announced the find in his message to Congress in December of 1848, 80,000 people rushed to California in search of gold the following year. Over 50,000 of them came overland, while the rest came by ship, either by sailing around South America or by taking passage to Panama, going overland across the isthmus, and then sailing from Panama on to California.

The population explosion in the California territory raised the possibility of its statehood, which further intensified the question of slavery in the western territories. Wisconsin had become the thirtieth state in May of 1848, giving the Union fifteen slave states and fifteen free. The Mexican War had ended earlier that year, but Congress had taken no action on statehood for California or for any part of the new southwest region because of the impasse over slavery. The House voted for the new territories to be free; but southerners resented this, and some in the South began talking about leaving the Union.

The 1848 Election

The 1848 election saw both major parties dodge the issue of slavery in the territories. The Democrats nominated Lewis Cass of Michigan while the Whigs tapped Mexican War hero Zachary Taylor. The Free Soil Party was composed of antislavery people who were disgruntled with both major parties. In 1848 they nominated Martin Van Buren for President and Charles Francis Adams Sr., the son of John Quincy Adams, for Vice President.

Zachary Taylor had never voted in a presidential election, and his position on the issues was unknown. The Whigs hoped to win the White House purely on Taylor’s military reputation, and it worked. A key element in Taylor’s victory was the fact that his vice presidential running mate was Millard Fillmore of New York. Fillmore’s popularity in his home state, coupled with the impact of the Free Soil Party there, gave the Whigs that state and the election. However, the Democrats controlled Congress.
Although Taylor was a slave owner, he believed that slavery could not exist in the West. After he became President, Taylor called for California to be admitted to the Union as a free state and indicated his willingness for New Mexico to be admitted under the same terms. The provisional governments that had been formed in both areas were antislavery. The admission of both states as free would upset the slave-free balance of states and set a precedent for future western states to ban slavery.

Taylor’s position angered the South. In 1850 a convention was held in Nashville, Tennessee, to discuss a unified southern position against what was termed “northern aggression.” Five states were officially represented, while delegates from four other states attended unofficially. The assembly adopted resolutions demanding equal access to the territories for slave owners.

Clay’s Final Compromise

Northerners did not want to delay the admission of California any longer, and southerners did not want California admitted under the terms being discussed. Henry Clay, the seventy-three-year-old master of compromise, proposed a series of measures in the Senate designed to break the deadlock:

- California would be admitted as a free state.
- The rest of the area received from Mexico would be organized as the Utah and New Mexico territories, which would decide for themselves whether or not to permit slavery.
- A border dispute between Texas and New Mexico regarding the Rio Grande would be settled in New Mexico’s favor, but Texas would receive compensation from the Federal government to settle pre-admission debts.
- The slave trade would be abolished in the District of Columbia, although slavery would continue to be permitted there.
- A new and tougher Fugitive Slave Law would force the return of slaves captured in free states to their southern owners.

The Senate debate over these proposals in early 1850 brought together for the last time some of the most eloquent spokesmen of the day. Henry Clay made an impassioned plea for his proposal as the only means to save the Union. John C. Calhoun prepared a speech warning of the dangers to the Union that the proposals carried and of the determination of
the South to stand by its rights, but he was too ill to deliver it himself. He was carried into the Senate on March 4 to hear it read by a southern colleague. Calhoun died March 31. On March 7, Daniel Webster spoke not as a New Englander or a Whig, he said, but as an American wanting to preserve the Union. He believed that slavery could not exist in the West, so he favored admitting California as a free state. However, to maintain peace he also supported the Fugitive Slave Law. This infuriated Webster’s fellow northerners, who believed that he had betrayed his antislavery principles.

The outlook for Clay’s compromise was not good. Clay’s Omnibus Bill containing all five components encountered tough going in Congress. In addition, President Taylor let it be known that he planned to veto the measure. Then on the hot July 4 of 1850, Taylor, now sixty-six years of age, attended festivities at the base of the unfinished Washington Monument. He went back to the White House, drank cold milk and water, apparently ate some raw food, developed a gastric disorder, and died five days later.

New President Millard Fillmore indicated his willingness to sign the compromise, and Clay broke his bill into separate parts so that his proposals could be passed more easily. Different coalitions within Congress enabled the passage of the separate bills. For instance, antislavery men and advocates of compromise voted for the admission of California; while proslavery men and compromisers voted for the Fugitive Slave Law. Many people in the country breathed a hopeful sigh of relief when all of the measures passed. They wanted to believe that the Compromise of 1850 was the answer to the national dilemma.

The package of legislation had several difficulties, however. (1) By leaving the slavery question open for Utah and New Mexico, the Compromise of 1850 only delayed the conflict there. (2) Since the different aspects of the compromise had been passed by different coalitions, no majority in Congress supported the entire package. (3) More immediately, the Fugitive Slave Law incensed many northerners. The law denied a jury trial for alleged fugitives. It applied to any slave who had ever run away, meaning that former slaves living in the North could be returned after having lived free for many years. In addition, the measure said that any citizen ordered by law enforcement officials to assist in the capture and return of fugitive slaves had to do so. Antislavery northerners saw the law as forcing them to work for something they opposed. The many incidents of non-compliance with the law in the North indicated the resistance that people felt toward it. Few slaves were actually returned to their owners under the law.

Millard Fillmore
George Peter Alexander Healy (American, 1857)
The 1852 Election

The 1852 election revealed that the Whig Party was coming apart. A split had developed between northern Conscience Whigs who opposed slavery and southern Cotton Whigs who supported it. Northern Whigs blocked the nomination of Millard Fillmore and were able to place another Mexican War hero, Winfield Scott, at the top of the ticket.

Divisions were apparent among Democrats as well. Northern Democrats generally wanted to leave the question of slavery to the states and were willing to go along with the expansion of slavery in the territories in the name of popular sovereignty. Southern Democrats, by contrast, were more strident in their support of slavery and wanted to see the right to own slaves protected in the territories and in future states. The Democrats nominated Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire, who had also served in the Mexican War and who supported the Compromise of 1850.

In the election, Pierce carried all but four states. He won a majority in both the North and the South (the last candidate to accomplish this feat until 1912, except during the unusual circumstances of 1868). The loss crushed the Whig Party, which soon passed out of existence. The new President did not have much time to savor his victory, though, as new crises soon confronted the nation.

The Transcontinental Railroad and Popular Sovereignty

The thoughts of many Americans were on the West. California entered the Union as the 31st state in September of 1850. Interest ran high in the development of other western territories as well, such as Oregon, Utah, and New Mexico. In addition, the U.S. was developing a desire for trade with the Far East. China opened four ports to American trading vessels in 1844, and Christian missionaries came to have a burden for the people of China. Commodore Matthew Perry began American contact with Japan in 1853, and trade with that nation got underway in 1858.

These political and economic developments, coming at a time of rapid expansion of railroads, led many Americans to dream of a rail line that ran across the entire continent and brought the nation together. Many politicians and businessmen east of the Mississippi River tried to use their influence to have the line built from their respective areas. One key politician who took a special interest in this issue was Illinois Democratic Senator Stephen Douglas. Douglas was short in stature but long on ambition. He believed in the United States and in himself. Sadly, his drive to become President led him to propose a policy that created an American tragedy.
Lesson 52 - Trouble in the Territories

Douglas wanted the transcontinental line to begin in Chicago, and he proposed that the region west of Iowa and Missouri (that is, the area that would become Kansas and Nebraska) be organized as territories that would eventually become states in order to provide government protection for the rail line. However, Douglas wanted these territories to forbid slavery. Southern Senators blocked this proposal because they wanted slavery to be allowed in all territories and also because they were hopeful that the cross-country rail line might be built along a southern route beginning from New Orleans and going to southern California.

Douglas saw that his plans were being derailed by southern opposition, so he compromised. He agreed to let the territories of Nebraska and Kansas decide by popular sovereignty whether they would be slave or free. Since both areas lay north of the 36°30' line that divided slave and free territories in the 1820 Missouri Compromise, Douglas proposed repealing the 1820 measure. Antislavery men felt betrayed by the idea. They said that, by supporting this proposal, the South was going back on an agreement it had made in 1820. Douglas was criticized as wanting to extend slavery. In fact, Douglas opposed slavery. He hoped that the two new states would be organized free, and he believed that they would be since he thought that slavery would not work on the prairie. However, he was not willing to let his personal opposition to slavery get in the way of his political ambition.

Bleeding Kansas

Congress passed the Kansas-Nebraska Act in May of 1854. The law allowed the question of slavery to be settled in the Kansas and Nebraska territories by popular sovereignty whether they would be slave or free. Since both areas lay north of the 36°30' line that divided slave and free territories in the 1820 Missouri Compromise, Douglas proposed repealing the 1820 measure. Antislavery men felt betrayed by the idea. They said that, by supporting this proposal, the South was going back on an agreement it had made in 1820. Douglas was criticized as wanting to extend slavery. In fact, Douglas opposed slavery. He hoped that the two new states would be organized free, and he believed that they would be since he thought that slavery would not work on the prairie. However, he was not willing to let his personal opposition to slavery get in the way of his political ambition.

The name of the party was an attempt to hearken back to the days of Thomas Jefferson.

Northerners hoped both Kansas and Nebraska would both be organized free, while southerners hoped at least one would permit slavery. It soon became apparent that Nebraska would forbid slavery, so the focus of attention came to be on Kansas. Some of those who settled in Kansas simply wanted to own land in a new territory, but many settlers entered the territory with either a proslavery or antislavery agenda. Both sides of the slavery issue rushed people into the territory in the hope that they could sway the voting that would form the territorial government. When an election was held for a territorial legislature in 1855, proslavery forces stole the election and set up a government in Lecompton which President Pierce recognized. Free-soilers rejected the Lecompton government and formed their own government for the territory in the town of Lawrence. This gave Kansas two competing territorial governments.

The proslavery forces obtained an indictment from a friendly judge against the antislavery government, and a posse set out for Lawrence to do away with the antislavery presence. Proslavery men wreaked destruction on the town, destroying a printing press and other property and causing one death. In response, four days later a free-soiler named John Brown led a group that attacked a proslavery settlement at Pottawatomie Creek and killed five
men in front of their families. The exchange of violence escalated, and by the end of 1856 over 200 people had been killed and $2 million in property had been destroyed. The territory became known as Bleeding Kansas.

Conflict in Congress

The United States Senate was the setting for another, related conflict in 1856. Republican Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner addressed the body in mid-May, lamenting what was happening in Kansas even before the Lawrence and Pottawatomie incidents. He blamed the South’s desire for additional slave states as the reason for the conflict, and he poured especially hateful words onto South Carolina’s Democratic Senator Andrew Butler. Sumner questioned Butler’s integrity and character. He said that Butler was committed to the harlot Slavery; and he ridiculed Butler’s manner of speech, even though Butler had been affected by a recent stroke and was absent from the Senate at the time.

What Else Was Happening?

1851  The first World Exhibition takes place in the Crystal Palace in London. The opening ceremony is depicted at right.
1851  Louis Napoleon leads a bloodless revolution in France, wiping out democratic gains. He crowns himself Napoleon III.
1851  Taipei radicals begin revolts against the ruling Ch‘ing dynasty in China.
1852  The first steam-powered dirigible balloon is flown at a speed of just under seven miles per hour.
1854  Louis Pasteur develops a process to prevent spoilage that comes to be called pasteurization.
1855  German chemist Robert Bunsen mixes air with coal gas to produce a flame for use in laboratory experiments. The device producing this flame comes to be called the Bunsen Burner.
1855  Peru abolishes slavery.
1856  Human bones are found in a cave in Germany’s Neander Valley. They come to be seen as evidence of what is called “Neanderthal man.”
1858  The first messages are sent along a transatlantic telegraph cable.
1859  The Suez Canal is begun. When it is finished ten years later, ships no longer have to go around Africa to sail between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans.
Butler’s nephew, Preston Brooks, was a South Carolina Congressman who took Sumner’s insults to heart. Two days after Sumner’s speech, Brooks entered the Senate chamber and confronted the Massachusetts Senator at his desk. Brooks began beating Sumner about the head and shoulders with his heavy, gold-headed cane, which broke in the attack. Sumner gripped his desk so firmly that he pulled it out of the floor as he fell. The Senator was incapacitated for over two years. He kept his Senate seat, however; and his empty chair made him a martyr for the antislavery cause. When the House censured Brooks, he resigned; but his South Carolina district re-elected Brooks, and several of his constituents sent him new canes to take with him when he returned to Congress. The whole affair increased the tension between the two sides. Americans were now attacking each other physically over the question of slavery.

*Assignments for Lesson 52*

**American Voices**
Read the excerpts from “Crime Against Kansas” by Charles Sumner (pages 188-192).

**Literature**
Continue reading *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*.

**Bible**
Read Romans 14:1-23. List three attitudes discussed in this passage that we should have toward other believers who have different opinions from ours.

Work on memorizing Psalm 133.

**Project**
Work on your project.

**Student Review**
Optional: Answer the questions for Lesson 52.
The debates in the U.S. Senate over the Compromise of 1850 brought together for the last time three political figures who dominated much of the first half of the nineteenth century. Each had significant impact on legislation and on the popular thinking of their times. Each was hugely influential in his own region but often misunderstood or despised outside of his own region. All three wanted to be President, but none was elected to serve as chief executive. This lesson examines the careers of those three men: Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and John C. Calhoun. They are depicted above in a debate about the Compromise of 1850. Clay is standing and speaking in the center. Daniel Webster is seated to the left of Clay leaning on his hand. Calhoun is beside the Speaker’s chair.

Henry Clay (1777-1852)

Henry Clay was the master of political compromise. During his legislative career, Clay crafted several plans that gave at least something to both sides in a political dispute while avoiding a complete division of the country. In doing this, Clay proved himself to be a skilled political negotiator.

Clay was born in Virginia, but in 1797 he moved to the new state of Kentucky as a twenty-year-old lawyer. He saw possibilities for advancement in an area where new leadership would be needed. Clay settled in the growing town of Lexington and was elected to the state legislature in 1803. The Kentucky state legislature chose him to fill out a United States Senate term in 1806, even though he was not yet the constitutionally-required age of thirty (no one seemed to notice, and he was duly sworn in). While in the Senate he gave impassioned speeches that turned heads. In the evenings he developed a reputation as a gambler.

In 1807 he was re-elected to the state house of representatives and was chosen to be speaker of that body. Three years later, Clay was chosen for another brief stint in the U.S. Senate. In 1811 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, and in his first term Clay was chosen as the Speaker of the House. Clay used his position to advance his ideas and his friends, and he became known as a War Hawk who encouraged the U.S. to go to war against Great Britain. Clay was a member of the U.S. commission that went to Europe in 1814 and, with their British counterparts, drafted the peace treaty which ended the War of 1812.

Following his service on the peace commission, in 1815 Clay again assumed his seat in Congress and ardently advocated what he called the American
System. This was a program of Federally-funded internal improvements, such as roads and canals, that would facilitate travel and commerce and bring the growing nation closer together. It also involved a protective tariff to help American manufacturers and the re-establishment of a national bank. When the issue of Missouri's admission to the Union as a slave state threatened the fabric of the nation, Clay played a key role in crafting the Missouri Compromise of 1820. Clay retired from Congress in 1821, was re-elected in 1822, and again became Speaker of the House.

In 1824 Clay made his first run for the presidency. He was defeated in the four-way race that resulted in the election of John Quincy Adams. His agreement to support Adams' candidacy apparently resulted in Adams naming him Secretary of State, a “corrupt bargain” in the eyes of Andrew Jackson and Jackson's supporters.

Clay was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1831 and again ran for President the following year against Andrew Jackson. Again, Clay was defeated. In 1833 Senator Clay helped to formulate the lower tariff that ended the nullification crisis. The following year, the Whig Party formed in opposition to Jackson's policies, with Clay as one of its leaders.

Clay resigned from the Senate in 1842, and two years later he was nominated by the Whigs as their presidential candidate. Again, Clay met defeat, this time at the hands of James K. Polk. Clay was elected to the Senate in 1849 and helped to fashion the Compromise of 1850. He resigned from the Senate in late 1851 and died June 29, 1852.

Daniel Webster (1782-1852)

The most gifted orator of his day, an ardent nationalist, and a Federalist who became a Whig, Daniel Webster was born in New Hampshire in 1782. He attended Dartmouth College (which is located in New Hampshire) and then became an attorney in 1807.
Webster was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1812 as an outspoken opponent of the war with England that had already been declared. He believed that the war would hurt New England’s economic interests, especially its international trade. In 1814 Webster began arguing cases before the U.S. Supreme Court, an activity he continued even while he was a member of Congress. Then in 1816, Webster decided to move to Boston because he believed that such a change would further his political and legal careers. Nevertheless, he retained his seat in Congress from New Hampshire until that session of Congress ended in March of 1817.

Webster quickly developed a positive reputation in Boston; in 1822 he was elected to Congress from Massachusetts. Five years later, the Massachusetts legislature chose him to be a U.S. Senator. He served in the Senate until he became Secretary of State under William Henry Harrison in 1841. He remained in that post until 1843. While Secretary of State, Webster negotiated a treaty with Great Britain that settled the boundary lines with Canada between Maine and New Brunswick and west of Lake Superior. He was re-elected to the Senate in 1843 and served there through the debate on the Compromise of 1850. Soon after Millard Fillmore became President, he chose Webster to be his Secretary of State. Webster held that role until his death in 1852.

During his career, Webster supported what he saw as the most important interests of New England. At first he supported a low tariff to help the Massachusetts shipping industry; but then he switched and supported a high tariff to protect Massachusetts manufacturers. Although he was a Whig, he strongly endorsed Andrew Jackson’s nationalist stance in the nullification crisis with South Carolina. In 1850 Webster opposed the expansion of slavery but feared the breakup of the Union even more; thus he supported the Compromise of 1850. As Secretary of State, Webster tried to administer strict enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law, which cost him support among northern Whigs.

In 1836 Webster was one of three regional Whig candidates for President. He carried only Massachusetts. Webster was considered for the Whig nomination in 1848 and 1852, but he was not selected by the party as its candidate either time.

**Quotations from Daniel Webster**

*God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it.*

*The Bible is a book of faith, and a book of doctrine, and a book of morals, and a book of religion, of especial revelation from God.*

*America has furnished to the world the character of Washington. And if our American institutions had done nothing else, that alone would have entitled them to the respect of mankind.*

*Inconsistencies of opinion, arising from changes of circumstances, are often justifiable.*

*I was born an American; I will live an American; I shall die an American.*

Portrait by Francis Alexander (American, 1835)
Lesson 53 - Twilight of the Giants

John C. Calhoun (1782-1850)

John Caldwell Calhoun of South Carolina, a graduate of Yale and trained as an attorney, is widely regarded as one of the most brilliant men ever to serve in Congress. He was a strong defender of slavery and a leading advocate of states’ rights in their relationship with the Federal government.

Calhoun was elected to the South Carolina legislature in 1808, then was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1811. In Congress he was an ardent supporter of the War of 1812 with England. He served as Secretary of War under President James Monroe (1817-1825). During this period, Calhoun was a strong nationalist who supported Clay’s American System of Federally-funded internal improvements, a national bank, and a strong central government.

In 1824 he briefly sought the presidential nomination but later decided to seek the position of Vice President, which he won in the election that year. After serving under John Quincy Adams, Calhoun was again elected Vice President when Andrew Jackson was elected President in 1828. However, Calhoun came to believe that southern interests were hurt by a strong Federal government; so he developed the theory of a state’s right to nullify a Federal law. Calhoun and Jackson had sharp disagreement over this issue, and Calhoun resigned as Vice President before Jackson’s first term ended.

Calhoun was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1832 and served in that body for most of the rest of his life. He believed that the right to own slaves should be extended into the territories and that civil war and disunion would result if this right were not protected. He served as John Tyler’s Secretary of State in 1844 and 1845, and in that position he helped to bring about the annexation of Texas.

Calhoun died a few days after his last speech was read in the Senate during the debate over the Compromise of 1850.

Quotations from John C. Calhoun

A power has risen up in the government greater than the people themselves, consisting of many and various powerful interests, combined into one mass, and held together by the cohesive power of the vast surplus in the banks.

It is harder to preserve than to obtain liberty.

The object of a Constitution is to restrain the Government, as that of laws is to restrain individuals.

The Government of the absolute majority instead of the Government of the people is but the Government of the strongest interests; and when not efficiently checked, it is the most tyrannical and oppressive that can be devised.

Beware the wrath of a patient adversary.

In looking back, I see nothing to regret and little to correct.

Portrait by George Peter Alexander Healy (American, c. 1845)
O Lord, who may abide in Your tent? Who may dwell on Your holy hill?
He who walks with integrity, and works righteousness,
and speaks truth in his heart.
Psalm 15:1-2

* Assignments for Lesson 53 *

**American Voices**  
Read the excerpts from the speeches on the Compromise of 1850 by Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, and John C. Calhoun (pages 171-175).

**Literature**  
Continue reading *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

**Bible**  
Read 1 Corinthians 12:4-27. List three positive attitudes that are taught in this passage about the different gifts or abilities that God gives us.

Work on memorizing Psalm 133.

**Project**  
Work on your project.

**Student Review**  
Optional: Answer the questions for Lesson 53.
President Franklin Pierce was an ineffective leader who generally supported the South’s position. For instance, he sent diplomats to Ostend, Belgium, in 1854 to discuss the possibility of buying or taking Cuba from Spain. Since Cuba already had slavery, the declaration of American interest in Cuba, called the Ostend Manifesto, was seen by many as an attempt to extend slavery. The Pierce Administration had to give up the idea when it met severe criticism in America and in other countries.

For the 1856 election, the Democrats backed away from Pierce and instead nominated James Buchanan of Pennsylvania. Buchanan was a long-time Congressman and a former diplomat. He had served as Secretary of State under James K. Polk. Buchanan endorsed the Kansas-Nebraska Act and said that Congress should not interfere with slavery in the states or the territories. The American (“Know-Nothing”) Party and a remnant of the Whig Party both nominated Millard Fillmore, but all knew he had little chance of winning.

The new Republican Party tried a trick that the Whigs had used by nominating a military hero, John C. Fremont, known as The Pathfinder. Fremont had become well-known by mapping the Oregon Trail in 1842. His work had encouraged further western settlement. Fremont was leading a small band of men in California during the Mexican War when another group set up the Bear Flag Republic in California, a move that Fremont endorsed. The Republican platform of 1856 supported a transcontinental railroad and internal improvements and opposed slavery and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. This was the first time that a major political party had taken a specific stand against slavery. The Republicans’ slogan was, “Free Soil, Free Speech, and Fremont.”

The Democrat Buchanan swept the South except for Maryland and carried a handful of northern states to win the election. Fremont carried eleven northern states. Overall, the Republican Party did remarkably well after being in existence for less than two years.

The **Dred Scott Decision**

Two days after Buchanan was inaugurated in March of 1857, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, a decision which appeared to support the proslavery cause. Dred Scott was a slave owned by an Army surgeon in St. Louis, Missouri. Scott’s master had taken him to Illinois and then to the Wisconsin Territory—both free areas—before returning to St. Louis. After his master died in 1843, Scott
tried to buy his freedom. In 1846, with help from antislavery supporters, Scott sued in a Missouri state court, claiming that he was actually free since he had lived in free areas. A jury decided in his favor, the Missouri Supreme Court ruled against him on appeal, and the case was finally brought before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Chief Justice Roger B. Taney (pronounced TAW-ney) from Maryland and four other justices from slave states joined together to deny Scott’s appeal. Taney said that Scott had no standing before the Court because he was not a citizen. Taney denied that the founders envisioned slaves or their descendants ever being citizens. Further, Taney held that being a citizen of a state did not automatically make a person a citizen of the United States. Moreover, the Court ruled that the Missouri Compromise of 1820 was unconstitutional since it had denied citizens equal rights of property by declaring certain areas of the country as free. The Court affirmed the idea that slavery was a state and not a Federal issue.

The Dred Scott decision strengthened the belief of proslavery men that antislavery forces were trying to rob them of their constitutional rights. On the other hand, it affirmed to opponents of slavery their belief that the Federal government was controlled by people who wanted to protect and extend slavery. The Dred Scott decision said, in effect, that popular sovereignty was illegal because it would deny people their property ownership rights since slaves were considered property. The Court also rendered invalid any attempt by Congress to reach a compromise, since it said slavery was not an issue that the Federal government could address. The Dred Scott decision served to harden the positions of both sides.
Further Uncertainties

Later in 1857, President Buchanan, like Pierce before him, endorsed the proslavery government of Kansas. However, Congress ordered another election the next year to be overseen by the Federal government. In that election, the antislavery forces won the day. Kansas was now firmly in the antislavery camp and ceased to be an issue in the slavery debate. However, it did not become a state until January of 1861.

An economic downturn in 1857 was another blow to the stability of the Buchanan presidency. The U.S. economy suffered from slower grain sales to Europe, over-production by American manufacturers, and continued problems in the banking system that was controlled by the states. The failure of a major insurance company precipitated a recession which lasted for two years. However, the sale of cotton to foreign buyers recovered fairly quickly, leading many in the South to believe that cotton’s importance in the national and world economy was too great to be trifled with.

Lincoln and Douglas

Illinois was the scene of a contest in 1858 that further dramatized the conflict over slavery. Senator Stephen Douglas was up for re-election, and he hoped that a victory would propel him toward an 1860 run for the presidency. The Republicans nominated as his opponent Springfield attorney and one-time Whig state legislator and Congressman Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln had once worked on a riverboat to New Orleans and had seen the impact of slavery on people’s lives. He fiercely opposed slavery and wanted to prevent its spread to the territories. However, he was not an abolitionist. He did not advocate direct action to end slavery where it existed in southern states. In addition, he did not believe
that the two races could peacefully live together as equals. Lincoln had become a Republican in 1856, when he backed Fremont for President. In 1858 he was the most prominent Republican in Illinois and the logical choice to oppose Douglas. He gave his famous “House Divided” speech when he accepted the party’s nomination to run against Douglas for the Senate.

Lincoln challenged Douglas to a series of debates around the state, and seven debates were held. The two candidates could not have made a sharper contrast. Douglas was short, stout, cocky, well-dressed, and eloquent. Lincoln was tall (about 6’4”), lanky (about 180 pounds), dressed in well-worn clothes, and used a homespun, humorous speaking style. Lincoln said that he wanted to contain slavery to the states where it currently existed. He believed that it would eventually die out. The Republican candidate portrayed Douglas as promoting slavery. On the other hand, Douglas said he favored popular sovereignty and painted Lincoln as an abolitionist. Lincoln charged that Douglas was indifferent to the moral question of slavery, whereas Lincoln said he believed it was wrong (“If slavery is not wrong then nothing is wrong,” he said).

Lincoln challenged the idea of popular sovereignty on the basis of the Dred Scott decision. How could the people of a territory, Lincoln asked, legally exclude slavery? Douglas replied that all a territorial legislature had to do was simply refrain from passing laws concerning slavery; slavery could not establish itself, he said. As many in the nation had their eyes on the Illinois Senate race, Douglas’ efforts to maintain the middle ground cost him support from both northern and southern Democrats. Douglas was not antislavery enough to satisfy northerners and not proslavery enough to satisfy southerners.

The senatorial election, however, was not directly in the hands of Illinois voters. State legislatures chose U.S. Senators in those days. The Lincoln-Douglas debates were actually intended to influence voters to elect candidates for the Illinois state legislature who represented their respective sides. Lincoln supporters got more total votes, but Democrats won a majority of seats and Douglas was re-elected to the U.S. Senate. However, the Democrats lost control of the U.S. House of Representatives in the 1858 election. A majority of the body was antislavery, but still it did not take any action against slavery.

**John Brown’s Raid**

One more dramatic incident led up to the momentous events of 1860 and 1861. John Brown had killed for the abolitionist cause in Kansas but then had disappeared from public view. On October 16, 1859, Brown led a raid on the military arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia (now in West Virginia). Apparently his purpose was to arm slaves and encourage them to revolt. Brown took a few hostages and remained holed up in the arsenal while a force led by Robert E. Lee and J. E. B. Stuart invaded the arsenal and captured

*This photograph from about 1846 shows John Brown holding a flag thought to represent a theoretical organization called the Subterranean Pass Way, Brown’s violent addition to the Underground Railroad.*
Brown. In all, fourteen people were killed in the incident and seven conspirators were captured. Brown was convicted of treason and was executed on December 2, 1859.

Prominent northern Republicans, including Lincoln, condemned Brown’s raid; but William Lloyd Garrison and other antislavery leaders supported him. Brown became a martyr for the abolitionist cause. Ralph Waldo Emerson said that Brown’s death would make the gallows as glorious as the cross. Apparently Brown had been financed by northerners; and the whole incident panicked and infuriated many southerners, who saw no difference among Brown, abolitionists, and the Republican Party. Many southerners were already paranoid about the possibility of a slave insurrection, and John Brown’s raid only confirmed their fears.

When Congress assembled in December of 1859, the antislavery Republican Party controlled the House. The debate over slavery created a standoff in Congress as the nation awaited the election of 1860.
Whoever sheds man’s blood, by man his blood shall be shed,
For in the image of God He made man.
Genesis 9:6

Assignments for Lesson 54

American Voices
Read the “House Divided” speech by Abraham Lincoln (pages 193-197.)

Literature
Continue reading Uncle Tom’s Cabin.

Bible
Read 1 Peter 4:7-11. List three ways that Christians are to act toward one another that are taught in this passage.
Work on memorizing Psalm 133.

Project
Work on your project.

Student Review
Optional: Answer the questions for Lesson 54.
People have differences. We differ from each other in terms of our appearance, our family backgrounds, and our ethnic and national backgrounds. We are different because we have different experiences that affect our attitudes and beliefs. Men and women are different from each other because “male and female He created them” (Genesis 1:27), and these gender differences go far beyond mere physical characteristics. We have different personalities. Some are outgoing while others are shy; some are reluctant while others are bold; and the list goes on.

Differences are often the source of conflict. Two nations do not like each other, so they go to war. A husband and a wife do not understand why they are different from each other, so they have marital conflict. Two groups of Christians do not see a matter in the same way, so they divide and question each other’s faithfulness to Christ. The Christians in Rome had a problem because they did not value the diversity in their fellowship and instead condemned those whose scruples were different from their own (Romans 14:1-15:13).

However, differences do not have to be a source of conflict. Diversity can be a strength or a weakness depending upon how people see it and use it. Diversity allows a group to do more than it could if all were alike. Diversity also encourages growth as people learn from each other. Paul said that a body is stronger because of the diversity of its members (1 Corinthians 12:12-28).

In the period before the Civil War, the United States struggled with its diversity. As we have noted, people in different sections of the country developed different—and often conflicting—views on issues. Defenders of slavery and opponents of slavery showed little respect for one another. The way that the people of the United States and the state and Federal governments handled their differences eventually led to war. In this lesson we will consider what the Bible says about handling differences.

Oneness in Christ

It is hard to imagine a more radical difference between people than the difference that existed in

Also known as the Mojave Memorial Cross, this memorial was original erected in 1934. After the area became the Mojave National Preserve, administered by the National Park Service, in 1994, someone objected that a cross on Federal land violated the First Amendment. After a lengthy court battle, the land around the cross was made private land in exchange for other land given to the government.
The ancient world between Jews and Gentiles. This difference involved their spiritual worldview, their ethnic background, their experiences, and how they viewed the other group. For the most part, Jews and Gentiles did not care for each other and did not understand or respect each other.

The gospel of Christ was first preached to Jews, but then God nudged some Jewish Christians to share the good news with Gentiles (see Acts 10 and 11). This caused no small degree of concern among some believers, but the apostles explained that it was the work of God and that the church should not make distinctions between Christians from different backgrounds (Acts 15).

Paul explained that in Christ people who were different from each other were made into one new kind of person (Ephesians 2:11-22). Christ “broke down the barrier of the dividing wall” (Ephesians 2:14), and thus all believers are fellow-citizens of God’s household (Ephesians 2:19). No difference between believers is more important than the oneness that they share. The unity of believers is not a brittle and tenuous compromise that Christians cobble together by their own wits. Instead, it is a gift from God, created by the death of Jesus on the cross. Christians can either cherish and treasure their unity as a stewardship from God, or they can abuse and fracture this precious gift and treat it as worthless.

Some Differences Are Wrong

Not all differences are morally neutral. Some differences that arise among believers involve sin. Jesus recognized that people wrong one another. He gave specific instructions for what to do when someone sins and when someone is sinned against (Matthew 5:21-24, 18:15-20). Paul told the Christians in Galatia to handle gently someone who had become entangled in sin (Galatians 6:1).

Not all differences in belief are merely matters of opinion. Many passages in the New Testament deal with false teachings and with those who cause hindrances and stumbling blocks in the fellowship (see, for instance, Romans 16:17-18, 1 Timothy 1:3-4 and 6:3-5, Philippians 3:18-19, and Colossians 2:8). The Bible does not teach that all belief systems are equally valid. Some ideas are right, and some are wrong. Christians are to oppose false teachings lovingly, but to oppose them just the same. The church in Corinth had been splintered by divisions, partly because of loyalties to various preachers (1 Corinthians 1:10-12). Paul said that the divisions at least served the purpose of making evident who was approved and who was not (1 Corinthians 11:18-19).

Some Differences Are Good

Another problem in Corinth was that people had begun to compare and rank the spiritual gifts God had given them. In 1 Corinthians 12, Paul explained to them how they should see their differences. All of their gifts, he said, are from the same Spirit (verse 4). They should exercise their gifts for the common good (verse 7). God created the different parts of the human body so that it could function fully (verse 18). If the body were all hand or all foot, it could not accomplish what it can with hands and feet and all the other members (verses
A member of the body should not feel inferior to or superior over other members (verses 15-19). God arranged the body with just the right members for just the right purposes (verse 21-25). All the members of a body rejoice or suffer as one (verse 26).

In Ephesians 4:1-16, Paul says that within the oneness that comes from God, Christ has given many gifts and roles “for the equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ” (verse 12). The differences among us in terms of what we bring to the fellowship by the grace of God are intended to help us keep from being tossed around by false doctrine and to help us grow up in Christ. Every member of the body has a role to play in the spiritual growth of the fellowship (verses 14-16; see also Romans 12:4-8 and 1 Peter 4:10-11 for similar ideas).

Some Differences Are Matters of Opinion

Romans 14:1-15:13 teaches that some differences in belief and practice are merely matters of opinion and should not cause divisions in the body. Some Christians are weak in faith. They should be accepted in the fellowship, but not in a condescending way (14:1). The two specific issues Paul mentions involve eating meat versus eating vegetables only and regarding one day as special versus regarding all days alike (14:2, 5). Each member of the body should be fully convinced in his own mind about such matters and should remember that all of us answer to the Lord and not to each other (14:4, 6). We should not judge our brothers or regard our brothers with contempt (14:10). “The faith which you have, have as your own conviction before God” (14:22).

Instead, we should strive not to cause a brother to stumble by influencing him to do something he believes is wrong (14:13). We do not live for ourselves (14:7). We should not hurt a brother over a minor issue like food (14:15). This is not what the kingdom of God is about (14:17).

Paul’s goal in this teaching is for the Christians in Rome to “accept one another, just as Christ also accepted us to the glory of God” (Romans 15:7). It is quite likely that Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in Rome were having a hard time getting along with each other. Jewish Christians might have had scruples about not eating meat that had been sacrificed to idols, and they might have wanted to keep observing Jewish feast days. Gentile Christians, by contrast, had no such scruples about food and considered all days the same. None of this was as important as the need to glorify God with one voice and with one accord (15:6).
The difficult part in applying this passage today is that it is a matter of opinion what constitutes a matter of opinion. The tendency on the part of many Christians is to see all perspectives and beliefs that are not the same as their own as not just different opinions but as doctrinally wrong positions. This tendency has caused much of the division in the Christian world. We have been quicker to condemn than to accept those who differ from us.

The world has many ways that it divides people, including ethnically, economically, and religiously. Christians who act just as divisive as the world does weaken the church’s message to the world. However, when Christians accept their differences as a source of strength, accept each other’s personal faith as their own business before God, and cherish their precious unity in Christ, they will have a richer spiritual life and will have a powerful message to a divided world.

“I do not ask on behalf of these alone, but for those also who believe in Me through their word; that they may all be one; even as You, Father, are in Me and I in You, that they also may be in Us, so that the world may believe that You sent Me.”

John 17:20-21

★ Assignments for Lesson 55 ★

**Literature** Finish reading *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*. Literary analysis available in *Student Review*.

Write a paragraph on why you think *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* was so important in the debate over slavery.

**Bible** Recite or write Psalm 133 from memory.

**Project** Complete your project for the unit.

**Student Review** Optional: Answer the questions for Lesson 55 and *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and take the quiz for Unit 11.
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