

[Forums](#) / [Lecture Material](#) / [1.2 In The Beginning](#)[Help](#)

## Rights of States to Secede from the Union

✉ You are subscribed. [Unsubscribe](#)

🏷 No tags yet. [+ Add Tag](#)

Sort replies by: [Oldest first](#) [Newest first](#) [Most popular](#)

[Fernando Von Hinke](#) · 2 months ago 🗨

I am very much interested in the Independence process and Constitution of the US as it has served as a base for many other Constitutions throughout the Americas (Argentina has a Preamble similar to the one been discussed in these lectures), and are trying to read as much as I can, from all sides.

One of the books I read is "The Politically Incorrect Guide to the Constitution," by Kevin Gutzman, and in it he states that the Civil War was not a civil war per se.

"A civil war is a war for control of a single government. ... In the American war of 1861-1865, the Confederate states had no desire to rule New York or Indiana. They wanted to separate from them, to achieve independence."

Later, he states;

"there was no point at which Virginia, for example, agreed to join in a consolidation, to be amalgamated into one American mass. Rather, the delegates of the Richmond Ratification Convention of 1788 were told that their state would remain one of the thirteen parties to a confederation, and that it could reclaim all its old powers if the federal government should pervert those powers to Virginia's injury."

I am no expert, but there seems to be disagreement about the clarity of the Preamble as regard to impossibility of states to secede from the Union if the federal government encroached on their rights. I understand the Federalists desire to have a more perfect union to stay stronger, but I also believe certain states got into it under the understanding they could get out.

Anybody else has any thoughts on this?

Thanks,  
Fernando

↑ 8 ↓ · flag

[David Casaceli](#) Signature Track · 2 months ago 🗨

It is a hot topic and time has blurred history. You will hear the current academia understanding in this class the constitution created an insoluble union. The most all encompassing piece I can recommend that argues the opposite, that the constitution was a compact between the states and the states

reserved the right to secession can be found in Albert Taylor Bledsoe's book "Is David a Traitor? Or was secession a constitutional right previous to the war of 1861."

buy reprint -> <http://www.amazon.com/Is-Davis-Traitor-Secession-Constitutional/dp/B008TYU1E4>

or read free online-> <https://archive.org/details/isdavisatraitor00bledgoog>

This was written in 1866 when the recent bloody war and spirited debate of the Confederate States of America was alive and fresh in everyone's minds.

↑ 8 ↓ · flag



Gayle Morrow · 2 months ago

Thanks for the link, David.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Naomi D. Roberts Signature Track · 2 months ago

...i can't wait to read Bledsoe's book!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 2 months ago

It seems to me many people today develop an idea of history that never existed to fill a particular need in the market place. Like someone today offering an option for that state that might go it alone. Too often they are rewarded because many people would like supporting documentation to fit their desire for something provocative. There ought to be a better understanding the differences what's fiction and what's a scholarly work.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag



Anthony Watkins · a month ago

one would think the purpose of taking this course is to see what a well educated man (the prof) has to tell us about the facts and then get his take on what conclusions we may draw from the facts. It is clear that there are a few folks here who have a better grasp on these matters than some of the rest of us, but even they are not teaching the course. I understand that Amar's positions are relatively well known, but to take on his logic without listening to the course seems to beg the question why one bothers to take it, unless one is a "troll."

one also might wonder why one of the biggest critics of the course is afraid to use his or her real name.

Not that it will likely matter to anyone else, but from this point forward, i will not consider or

respond to anonymous postings, as they are of no value to an honest discussion.

↑ 7 ↓ · flag



Mark Heyne · a month ago

I have been in the "Constitutional Struggles in the Muslim World " course, and in that case there might well have been legitimate reasons for some participants to conceal their identities, if for example if their governments were excessively secretive and engaged in wide-scale surveillance of their citizens' personal internet use and cell-phone communications .....hey, wait a minute!!!

↑ 5 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott

Signature Track

· a month ago

### Anthony Watkins

Thank you so much for your reasoned plea. It is really distracting when people with a point of view and manufactured facts try to advise others what they know is more important than the instructor. We have a complicated subject with plenty to learn without the aid experts having taught themselves with information from Blogs funded by hard right 501(c)3s.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

A post was deleted



Anthony Watkins · a month ago

Help yourself, at least in my account. I am assuming (though possibly mistakenly so) you were addressing my comments?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Mark Nisson

· a month ago

David, not that it's any of my business why you take the course, but your statement above--that your purpose is to challenge your beliefs and to solidify whether you have discovered the truth--is in stark contrast to the post wherein you introduced yourself. In that [post](#) you said this:

*I have come here to learn what I would consider revisionist history. To learn how the academic-industrial complex teaches mis-truths of history to better combat these efforts in the future and to find the 'holes' in the half-truths taught that have turned a free and prosperous nation into welfare, warfare, failing nanny state.*

Learning to better combat the "mis-truths" you believe are being foisted upon an unwitting

public is not quite the same thing as challenging your own beliefs. So, again, while it's none of my business why you've chosen to take the course, a little honesty might be nice.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Mark, you seem to have given yourself the role of who can say what in order preserve your world view of what can be said here in this discussion. just and observation but free speech means no gate keeping ... especially in a class on the constitution. Just an observation based on a repeated behavior. you questioned me too on why I was taking the course. ismitntime to,retire that one? not an attack.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Mark Nisson · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Anon, you are quite right, and I am no longer questioning anyone's reason for taking the class. Your posts have taught me that the membership of a MOOC course includes all the usual trolls one finds all over the Internet. In fact, you're the reason I unsubscribed from this thread until I checked in tonight out of curiosity.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

and here i thought you wanted to assert gatekeeper function over the Internet ... Hillary suggested the need. Have to admire you for admitting your impulse was wrong in a public forum. of course troll comment was less than generous.

unsubscribing is much the same thing the North suggested in 1812 when they first suggested secession from the Union to when the South did it 5 decades later. Your withdrawal was exactly in the same spirit. Now suppose I had the power to compel you to remain in the forum and require as a tax you have to read my ideas 8 hours per day from the first of the year to the middle of May. That is what it is like to people who don't want a large federal government that takes all their money and then even denies them the choice of their own doctor or medical care.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Mark Nisson · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Bravo! Analogizing a state's right to secede from the union with my right to unsubscribe from a Coursera discussion forum is a brilliant legal analysis upon which Oliver Wendell Holmes himself would have lavished much praise.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Augusto Hernandez · a month ago

No poetic introduction or lure of grandness and majesty is meant by the Preamble of the constitution. Here a fact is being made clear, "to form a **more** perfect Union", so, what was united then was refocused to a higher union, a perfect union. No secession allowances, no trying outs, as this would by its proper meaning cease to be perfect, or more perfect. And to perfect means to have no defects.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Mark Heyne · a month ago

More perfect doesn't mean perfect, Augusto, it just means better or improved. There seems to be a lot of evidence to show that the union was not indestructible, nor permanent.: "a republic, if you can keep it!" Secession was on the table from the beginning.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

I liked the part, Mark, where you have to read my posts as a tax. Holmes is on my list of least favorite justices so I got the rip.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Augusto Hernandez · a month ago

Hi Mark, please bear in mind that this is a new process, a new beginning and precisely because a new order is being established mistrust about how the way this union was to be made "more perfect" was settled in. The text implies "imperfection" regarding what they had at the moment and an improvement was thus necessary, secession is indeed an imperfection in this context, something that required attention, otherwise no union or constitution would be possible, precisely because secession was "on the table" from the beginning.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 14 days ago

Crimea was emptied by the USSR and filled with Russians. Expelled the Tartars (Muslims- some have been allowed to come back). Now the Crimean parliament has voted to leave Ukraine. What if the cite our Declaration of Independence as authority. Obama cites international law to say that they can't here rejoin Russia but in America we have never agreed that international law trumps our law.

What are we to think of this? Is this a repeating problem that results when the world sees progressive presidents in America are jokes?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 13 days ago 🔗

The Ukraine has always been a tough place to live. The Caucasus even more so. First they welcomed the Nazi's before they started killing the Ukrainians. The Cossacks were a rough bunch and were enforcers for the Czars. When I lived in Poland if you wanted someone to work hard and cheap labor you hired a Ukrainian. They were also in some small time crime I used to tell those crooked contractors you find in a communists country that my special security was a pair of Ukrainians that I could send over and they will kill my problem and every other living thing before they set your house on fire. It was mostly just a bluff but they never pushed me once I let them know the project I was managing wasn't going to be a place that extortion would be tolerated. They otherwise are very nice people just incredibly poor. I doubt we have much real power we sure don't want any military engagement between us and anybody in Eastern Europe. The Europeans have leverage and if they stick together they can freeze the bank accounts for the Russian Mob that runs the country and make them very uncomfortable.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 13 days ago 🔗

Ukraines were mostly German - invited into the Ukraine by Catherine the Great. Stalin decided to steal all their stuff and killed them in greater numbers than Hitler wiping out the Jews - <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holodomor>.

Prison guards in Hitler's germany were toughest on Jews because they viewed the Jews (rightly or wrongly) for the Holomodor. In football the second guy doing something wrong is the guy getting the penalty flag. The NY Times sent a guy named Walter Duranty in their to report on events and he gave a total white wash to the commies. SO progressives here in the USA have always fronted for and excused communist evil behavior. Why McCarthy was attacked and why Jane Fonda and John Kerry created a communist people's paradise in Vietnam.

Communism started here in the USA with the Haymarket Riot in Chicago in 1886. Cop killers back then too.

The commie McNamara brothers blew up the LA Times office - trial in 1911 - defended by leftist attorney Clarence Darrow who was convicted of bribery the jury so honest is the left.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · 2 months ago 🔗

I had the same impressions myself. Between the establishment of the Senate in Article I and all of Article IV, I feel the Constitution was designed as a merger between the States, where all are equal partners and had equal representation in the running of the joint venture. But I don't feel the Preamble's "perfect union" clause goes to the lengths that Dr. Amar believes it does. Certainly, he's basing his statements on the Federalist Papers and other historical notes from the period, but I wonder if there's a difference between what people state about the text post-facto versus what was stated at the time.

For myself, I think basing law on the Preamble is nonsensical. When I read the Preamble I see textual garnish. A poetic statement designed to assign grandeur to the document within. Just as you'd hang a beautiful painting in an ornate frame. That doesn't make the frame part of the painting, nor does it mean that you can learn more about the painting from studying the frame.

But, alas, SCOTUS seems to disagree with me on this score as well....

↑ 6 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Fernando,

It is ever that winners write the history. Even northern states discussed secession, at the Hartford Convention for instance. The Declaration of Independence expressly spells out how the process works. 20 years before the Civil War (or war between the states) S Carolina explained their ability to withdraw had exactly to do with the federal government's breaking its own rules over and over again. Republicans call Obama on that too but nothing happens. Northern states even went so far as to negotiate a separate peace with England in the war of 1812 ... proof they had no right to impose a different standard on the South.

Since the Civil War there has been a consolidation of power in the central government and neither the 9th or 10th Amendments mean anything to liberal judges or leftist members of congress. check out the civil war movies Ted Turner created. the South fought not so much for slavery but for the fact the people there had strong allegiance to their states and cared much much less about being a member of the larger group called America. Our professor is going to go to great lengths to try to justify the Civil War.

Lincoln did not fight the Civil War to free the slaves, he wanted to send them to Liberia. If you read his first inaugural address he told the South that they could keep their slaves just so long they just paid their taxes. Prior to his taking office Congress had just passed the Morrill Act which imposed tariffs on imports and the South largely paid the tax. Meaning that taxes were small back then and the North basically imposed a tax to be paid solely by the South. one group taxing another. like what if men were 51% of voters and they voted to legalize rape.

So when our professor will try to assert Lincoln was for the a union above all then why did Lincoln not campaign for election in even one state in the South even one time? The

North wanted the South's money by way of first stopping off in DC. The South believed in King Cotton ...the money was in the South and the North figured out how to take their money.

Btw, the South deserved to lose because they got rich off of the cotton gin invented and under patent to Eli Whitney. He was owed the equivalent of billions in royalties in today's dollars and they cheated him out of that money. He went back home to the North after failing to collect what was duly owed him and back there he invented interchangeable parts.

This placed manufacturing in the north so by logistics Grant bled the South of resources to fight.

Fun what if question ....what if the South was honest and paid Whitney what he was owed and manufacturing AND the cotton biz was located in the South. immigrants would have gone south and the north could never have passed the Morrill Tax ... not enough votes. Slavery in the South would have ended peacefully as it did everywhere else on earth.

Taxes and northern greed is why the Civil War started at Ft Sumter SC. that is where they collected taxes. and Lincoln pushed the South into the attack so he could get his war. Lincoln was in the pocket of the railroads and they didn't want states opening to the west to have slaves and a repeat of Bloody Kansas.

this war was all about money and power to bring control over free people to, a halt and have the central government dominate our lives. BO now believes he can do away with congress and rule all by himself. note how northern states to this day favor high taxes.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Naomi D. Roberts Signature Track · 2 months ago 🔗

an interesting and enlightening perspective, indeed. Thanks for sharing.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Ray Strong · 2 months ago 🔗

Quoted from Above: .....*why did Lincoln not campaign for election in even one state in the South even one time?*

If you had read the assigned books you would know that the South had passed legislation prohibiting the speaking against slavery or printing and distributing any anti-slavery material and prohibited such materials from being brought in from out of state. North Carolina's Statute called for the death penalty for the first offense.

Clear Violations of the first amendment and certainly signs of a closed society.

Find the book and read it for yourself just google it.

↑ 4 ↓ · flag



Anonymous · 2 months ago

Go to the Lincoln Library in Springfield IL. They have a TV show where Tim Russert makes the point that Lincoln claimed to represent the entire Nation but failed to campaign in the South. He could have campaigned in nearby Kentucky without fear as well as half of Tennessee. The North violated the constitution as well. Did anyone sure North Carolina?

0 · flag

A post was deleted

Anonymous · a month ago

>a Tim Russett video notwithstanding

Lincoln's own library has Russert's video. They chose to show it in exactly the way Russert put it forward

Russert's video is a permanent exhibit at the Lincoln library.

<http://www.waymarking.com/waymarks>

[/WMHZ24\\_Abraham\\_Lincoln\\_Presidential\\_Library\\_and\\_Museum\\_\\_Springfie...](#)

One of the museum's permanent exhibits, Campaign of 1860, features late "Meet the Press" anchor Tim Russert. In addition to its exhibits, the Lincoln Museum runs two special effects theater shows, Lincoln's Eyes and Ghosts of the Library. Both shows run several times an hour.

. Lincoln had no intent to represent the South whatsoever. Just read his first inaugural address:

<http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres31.html>

Keep your slaves, we will decide how to return runaway slaves not you and pay your taxes.

We (the North) just decided to raise your taxes 50% and spend the money in the North. And the place to collect taxes was Ft Sumter in SC.

As to incorrect views ... like I am citing where the war started (tax collector location), Lincoln's 1st inaugural and a permanent exhibit from the Lincoln library.

Read Lincoln's 1st inaugural address and tell me he intended to represent all the people of the USA in an equal manner. Slavery? - South keep your slaves. Taxes - pay them or else - regardless of how high we have already raised them on you.

Like the tax that got the Boston Tea Party was like 2% or so and Lincoln was fully supportive of a 50% raise in taxes ... and this was about the only tax for the federal government back then.

Obama is doing pretty much the same thing today ... the rich today are being demonized so he can use their money to buy votes. Railroad interests in the north loved taxes from the South

and Lincoln was their tool. \*none of which is to say slavery was good\*

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Albert Y. Kim

Signature Track

· a month ago 🔗

Anonymous' (again, can we please have ID's for Anonymous users, so we can at least tell them apart?) points echo "A People's History of the United States" by Howard Zinn. If I recall correctly, that the North wasn't motivated by benevolent ideology as they are commonly portrayed, but rather there were forces within the North that were seeking to advance their economic superiority.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 🔗

Albert,

Lincoln embodied a lot of what the North was about - more than one single idea (like ending slavery). The first way to consider Lincoln is to read his inaugural address - he said he had no legal means to end slavery in the South (which he did when he had a war going for him). If there was no war and he just said slavery was now illegal in the South what he did was destroy an awful lot of value there ... about 25% of families in the South owned slaves. if Lincoln had proposed to compensate them for their loss I don't think they would opt for the money but in any case they wound up losing that value.

The key for Lincoln was that the South should pay the tariff that had just been raised by quite a lot. This import tariff fell largely on the South and Lincoln was a strong railroad man ... meaning in the pocket of the big money guys and manifest destiny ... go west young man go west.

Howard Zinn was a Marxist and along with Oliver Stone's version of history (The Untold Story) are the most warped view you can get. Untruth about ... total Marxist view or spin.

The very big deal to Lincoln was the Intercontinental railroad. He did not wait for the war to be over. This railroad was started in 1863 and largely built by had and was finished in 1869. It made some very wealthy men really a lot wealthier.

The fact that the eastern terminus was in the North rather than the south made a huge difference as to which area got wealthy too.

The South had cheated Eli Whitney out of his royalties on the cotton gin so by going back north and inviting interchangeable parts manufacturing centered in the North. So the South got what was coming to them- crushed by cheating Whitney and their support of slavery.

Consider if they had been honest, they had the money and if they would also have had the

manufacturing so that the terminus for the railroad would have been in the South - a more logical location in the first place ... no need to deal with the high Sierras. Lincoln may well have been supportive of the South than the guy who destroyed it.

Guys like Mark Hopkins (international mark hopkins hotel biz), James Bailey, Charles Crocker (later Crocker Bank was his deal) and Leland Stanford (Stanford Univ is named for him) made a ton off the railroad and shafted Californians on the prices of good shipped over the railroad.

These guys owned both parties in California which in turn caused a populist outrage - and the election of reform governor Hiram Johnson in 1910. And the adoption of the initiative and referendum process where people get to directly create the law ... in a referendum the legislature passes the idea over to the people and in the initiative process the people create their own laws by their own decisions.

Of course a gay judge with multiple conflicts of interest can say the law is overturned (Prop 8 - one gay judge outvoted the people on the legality of gay marriage) but there is no reason to abide by his ruling. People just do.

The result of Lincoln's support of the intercontinental railroad was massive corruption by the railroad owners when they controlled the laws to their own benefit which in turn gave us the initiative process.

26 states now have the initiative process and any one of them could decide to finance turning coal or natural gas into gasoline (Sasol is building a big plant on LA to do this right now). Thus the initiative process could be used by the people in any of these 26 states to defeat greenies, the EPA, OPEC (end the funding of terrorism) and most importantly defeat Marxist Matt Damon, a life long friend of Marxist Howard Zinn.

<http://jhaines6.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/matt-damon-reads-from-howard-zinns-speech-the-problem-is-ci...>

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Paul Sherrill · 2 months ago 

Towards the end of Chapter 1 of his book, Prof. Amar brings up an argument that Lincoln made on this topic: the land, rivers, resources, etc. of the seceding states had been regulated and defended by the United States since the ratification of the Constitution. That means that everybody in the US had invested in developing & maintaining the Mississippi river, the cotton plantations of the South, and so on. By trying to secede from the Union, the Confederate states were trying to take control of land that already belonged to the entire people. The Confederate states may not have wanted to rule New York, but they did want to rule Georgia, which was just as much of a usurpation of the federal government's

sphere.

Prof. Amar's book also addresses your second quote from Gutzman. He argues that the ratifiers of the Constitution knew very well that they weren't merely entering into another confederation of sovereign states. I'm not a big enough history buff to know what other sources say, but it's definitely a big part of the argument in his first chapter, so I'd recommend reading it if you're still interested in the issue.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Paul,

The North passed the Morrill Tax right before Lincoln took office. The net effect was that the North taxed the South and took money from the South for their own needs.. if consideration for the Mississippi River cuts one way then one side taking money from the other empowered the South to leave. Lincoln, in his first inaugural, told the South, keep your slaves just pay your taxes.

Lincoln was in the pocket of big money ... the railroads. Not once in his election campaign step foot in even one Southern state so he hardly believed he spoke for all points of view. The reason why the Civil War started in the South at Ft Sumter in SC is thatnismwherenthe central government collected taxes. Northern states tomthismday have a different view on taxes and welfare than the South where people want to be left alone.

Look how many states opted out of Obamacare and look at the use of force and illegal means it used to impose will by central government over individual freedom. Look how Roberts had to simultaneously call it a tax and not a tax at the same time. Far worse decision than Dred Scott.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Timothy Lindsay · a month ago

The revolutionary right of secession is based on the *Declaration of Independence* and the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and John Locke, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of the ends for which it was established, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, . . .

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Timothy Lindsay · a month ago

A similar sentiment was expressed by Abraham Lincoln in 1847 on the floor of the United States House of Representatives: Any people, anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right, a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world.<sup>2</sup>

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Timothy Lindsay · a month ago

Some excellent constitutional arguments are summarized in an article entitled "The Foundations and Meaning of Secession," by Mr. H. Newcomb Morse, in the *Stetson Law Review*, a publication of the Stetson University College of Law.<sup>6</sup> Morse writes that the War Between the States did not prove that secession was illegal because many incidents both preceding and following the War support the proposition that the Southern States did have the right to secede from the Union. Instances of nullification prior to the War Between the States, contingencies under which certain states acceded to the Union, and the fact that the Southern States were made to surrender the right to secession all affirm the existence of a right to secede . . .<sup>7</sup>

He adds that the Constitution's "failure to forbid secession" and amendments dealing with secession that were proposed in Congress as Southern states were seceding strengthened his argument that "the Southern States had an absolute right to secede from the Union prior to the War Between the States."<sup>8</sup>

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Timothy Lindsay · a month ago

*The Madison Papers* who wrote "a breach of any one article by any one party, leaves all other parties at liberty to consider the whole convention as dissolved."<sup>9</sup> Vermont and Massachusetts, he points out, nullified with statutes, the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793, and those two breaches of the compact alone were enough for the South to consider the compact dissolved.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Timothy Lindsay · a month ago

#### RIGHT TO SUCCEED FOR 14TH -50TH STATES

Virginia used the exact wording of her conditional ratification of the U.S. Constitution, in her Ordinance of Secession. Morse points out that since the other states, which had unconditionally ratified the Constitution, consented to Virginia's conditional ratification, then they "**ostensibly assented to the principle that Virginia permissibly retained the right to secede.**" He adds that with the additional acceptance of "New York's and Rhode Island's right to secede, the existing states of the Union must have tacitly accepted the doctrine of secession." Further, Morse states that according to the Constitution, all the new states that joined the Union after the first thirteen also had the right of secession since new states entered on an equal footing with the exact same rights as the existing states.<sup>13</sup>

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Valeria Golyanova · a month ago

Timothy, can you give the link to the article?

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

A post was deleted



Valeria Golyanova · a month ago

The similar question appear at a lot of countries. For example secession is forbidden by Russian Constitution, but at legislation of some states (subject of Russian federation) you can find claims that indirectly point to secession right. Some of subjects of Russia Federation call themselves as state within the state ( with the sense of limited sovereignty).

↑ 1 ↓ · flag



Valeria Golyanova · a month ago

Moreover the world history has known a lot of examples of secession, when the fact of secession was in contradiction with constitution. The right of nations to self-determination is recognized by the international law. Initially this right was input in the international law in the sense of colonial countries. Nowadays there in no colony but the right is still effective. This right has new sense - this is the right for people to self- determinate their fate. They can determinate it by secession or the opposite by the accession to some country, or by the forming the new state.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

Timothy,

This discussion has a whole new tone. Facts winning out over option. Well done.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · a month ago

I doubt you would find enough people in any state really wanting to secede. The remedy of rebellion is well known. The military the rebels would find themselves up against is the finest in the world and they wouldn't think twice about punching anybody's ticket that rose up against the USA. So aside from idle speculation what do you hope to acheive with the right nobody would dare to impliment.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag



Anthony Watkins · a month ago

Well said. and even if the Union allowed the old seven from the deep south and even 5-6 more from the west to leave. How long before they came back begging to be let in when they realized their huge federal revenues and access to interstate commerce with the now much richer remaining union was cut off?

the "right to secede" if it ever existed, is no longer an option, even if the courts ruled it legit.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

you seem to be agreeing the right to secede existed and it was just a mistake for the South to leave the Union. Then 600,000 people died without a valid cause.

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

Michael,

Consider the peace movement here in the USA gave victory to communist aggression in Vietnam. All we are saying ... is give peace a chance. Conservatives irritate MSNBC and liberals and vice versa. Cities like Detroit will run out of money and beg to get more and if you put conditions on them, allow them to go bankrupt, redo sweetheart union pensions and LOWER the taxes they charge they can make comebacks.

My hope is after illegals all get to vote that they can be educated not to vote Democrat. Maybe a pipe dream but it saves the country from socialism.

↑ -3 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · a month ago

Nothing will be put right doing the obvious. Secretary Mellon during the depression of the 1930s tried to fix the American economy by cutting spending. Did things improve? No they only got worse! The reason we have shortages of money today is because none of the common folks are making a living thus do not pay taxes for necessary government services.

The Japanese have lived with our type of economy for twenty years already. They owe twice or more their annual GNP. The market crash of 1929 fell lower and lower and didn't reach the pre depression levels of the Dow Jones Averages till 1954. Those of us retired may never see the good times return before we leave this earth. So remedies you mention are only busy work on a sinking ship. We have transferred the future of our working class to Asians.

Nothing but our own hard work and ingenuity will bring back our earnings potential.

Conservative or liberal ideas for quick fixes are are opinions without merit. Success will only be known after we achieve it. Our generation based on our performance to date shows we

are no greatest generation. We might be the greediest generation and we have no solutions for a current dilemma.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

>Secretary Mellon during the depression of the 1930s tried to fix the American economy by cutting spending.

Fiscal policy is much smaller than monetary policy but as government grows to dominate the economy that ratio get higher and higher for government and less and less for monetary policy.

Listen to Friedman describe the cause and effect relation between quantity of money and the consequences the Fed was the causal agent. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dgyQslGLt\\_w](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dgyQslGLt_w)

Milton Friedman got a Nobel Prize for pointing out the federal reserve was the sole cause of the Great Depression ... first allowing massive creation of money supply and then sucking up all the liquidity. In 1936 we were coming out of the depression and then the fed sucked up liquidity and sent us back into a depression.

Marxists and big government advocates then blame capitalism when in fact it was the failure of government.

Our most recent real estate debacle was a consequence the Democrat's Community Reinvestment Act. Massive influx of credit behind real estate and loans to people who could not pay it back (as opposed to sneaky lenders who tricked people into taking out their loans - like see if those same type lenders can get a house for nothing down today). Bankers get blamed because our media is hard core leftist and refuse to pin the tale on the donkey (yes tale not tail).

BTW ... easy to bring back America ... everyone learn how to program computers.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

[Michael Scott](#) Signature Track · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Yes once again a Quick Fix is just talk composed of mostly heated air. Any solution bringing us back from our current financial problems will not be easy. This course covers the US Constitution you seem to be fixated on political arguments beyond the scope of this class. If you are interested in learning what is covered in the Syllabus here then follow the course instruction. Political discourse the type you have here is the do nothing strategy that Dems and Republicans have used to make the current mess we are in.



↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔗

If people want to learn to program computers they can. Quite different future than one where unemployment insurance is permanent for life because it buys votes for Democrats,. The original constitution dealt with fugitive slave and had a 3/5th rule in order that the North would not be outvoted by the South. Only those who paid taxes back then could vote ... which is not that bad an idea.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Timothy Lindsay · [a month ago](#) 🔗

Valeria Golyanova, Here is the link you asked for where I got most of my authority for my argument:

<http://www.bonniebluepublishing.com/The%20Right%20of%20Secession.htm>

May all free people have the right to throw off the bonds of oppression.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔗

Timothy:

From your source:

"the Northern occupational armies were removed from Arkansas, North Carolina, Florida, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Virginia only after those former Confederate States had incorporated in their constitutions a clause surrendering the right to secede."

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Philip Martinez · [a month ago](#) 🔗

" . . . armies were removed. . . after . . .former Confederate States .  
. .incorporated. . .surrendering the right to secede."

Now taking out all of the useless info, from reading this i came to the conclusion that the states [can] secede. If they could not, then [why] would the union make them incorporate language that they surrender the [right] to do so?

↑ 2 ↓ · flag



Valeria Golyanova · a month ago

Timothy, thanks! This really useful for my undergraduate research!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Valeria Golyanova · a month ago

I was reading this article and laughing - different countries, different cases, different times but the same arguments. All position and argumentation I v read already in doctrine about secession question in Russia Federation. The official position of our Constitution Court is similar to Mr. Webster "We the people." Those who argue that the Constitution is not a compact, but is a national document, believe that "We the People" means all of the American people in one body, and not in their sovereign states" (of course in over case it about the Ru people and the Ru Constitution", but there are a lot of authors are contravene using constitutional text and historical facts as at the beginning of the article. As for me, the potential right of secede is exist, but only if it most of the people of the territory want it, only if country governance is infringe on the peoples rights, and only if secession will not make ham to another part of the people (for example the threat of terrorism of war)

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Phil R. Bales · 21 days ago

Thanks for your comment Valeria. We in the USA have much to gain from the voices of our friends in Russia. I fear that the value of freedom is appreciated only by those who had to fight for it. In the USA, our children seem to assume that freedom from oppression is the natural state of man. I do hope they don't have to learn otherwise under the boot of tyranny.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

>We in the USA have much to gain from the voices of our friends in Russia.

Breaking news:

SIMFEROPOL, Ukraine — Masked gunmen on Thursday seized government buildings in the capital of the Crimea region of Ukraine, barricaded themselves inside and raised the Russian flag, raising the specter of a separatist rebellion that could tear the country apart.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · 2 months ago

It's interesting. I think Lincoln's ability to understand the intent of the Framers is hardly better than our

ability today, as he himself was many many generations set apart from them.

I don't contend that states have to right to secede in the 21st century, as the Civil War did settle many unsettled questions. However, I think one of the drivers of that Civil War was the *belief back then* by many states that they could secede if they wanted to.

I'm not saying I support secession. But people who contend that the Civil War relegated States to mere vassals of the national government are doing a disservice to the notion of separated and distributed government.

↑ 4 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

The end result of once in, always in is the party of central government using the IRS to suppress political opposition and then Eric Holder telling Ted Cruz that the DOJ can investigate itself and there is nothing the American people can do about it.

↑ -5 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

the end result of once in always in is that the party of central government using the IRS to suppress political opposition and then Eric Holder telling Ted Cruz that an Obama campaign contributor could investigate the case ... the DOJ investigating itself using a person with a conflict of interest and there is nothing the American people can do about it. We have established in the presidency a man above the law.

↑ -4 ↓ · flag

A post was deleted

[+ Comment](#)

James Rath · Signature Track · 2 months ago

The text makes the point that the Articles of Confederation was like a contract, and if a portion of the contract is nullified, participants can be relieved of their obligations under the contract. If the Articles were a contract, why isn't the Constitution properly seen as a contract. If the Constitution were properly amended by the processes specified in it to reduce Delaware's senate representatives to ONE, couldn't Delaware opt out of the union?

If the founders wanted the case to be "once in, always in," why didn't they write that in the Constitution. Now apologists need to cite some furtive implications found in the language of the Preamble, or the statements by Madison in the Federalist papers to support the claim that is what was meant. The text suggests that the ambiguity of this issue caused, in part, the Civil War. If the Constitution had been explicit, there could have been no case for South Carolina's leaving.

The text presents a rosy picture of the approval process. Another version, "Ratification" by Pauline Maier certainly paints a different picture. The biography reads like an hagiology.

Jim

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Jim,

See if supporters of once in, always in will strongly support the 9th and 10th Amendments. if not then there is a one-sided sale taking place.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · a month ago

The class text made a very good point in that a man and wife could divorce then live separately. A state in close proximity to another state has the geography that cannot be overcome with walls or other actions. It seems we have so many blogs on the Internet supplying content for a particular prejudice we are losing the ability to weigh evidence we don't like.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



Alec D. Rogers · 2 months ago

Personally, having read a lot of posts on this very question, I believe the best answer is that the Constitution doesn't provide an answer. It's what the lawyers (ok, we lawyers) call a "political question" meaning that the courts should properly defer to other branches of government.

I'd be a little wary of the book you cite (A Politically Incorrect Guide) though: it's definitely a very slanted and opinionated text. It needs to be read as a legal brief advancing a set of viewpoints rather than a scholarly work.

From my reading of the original debates in the various states, I think it was well understood by both sides, that this was to be a perpetual union. Otherwise opposition would have been much less fierce.

Still, without a Union Army, the South leaves and all the lawyers' fine points mean nothing. That's why I conclude it's a political question and the branch of government that provides the answer is the US Armed Forces at the time.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Read a little more ... Northern states at the Hartford Convention believed that they had the right to leave the union and northern states also negotiated a separate peace with England in the war of 1812.

The Declaration of Independence lays out the exact rules by which secession is legal. 20 years before the Civil War S Carolina laid out a legal brief of the many ways the federal government had broken its own rules and thus they could leave and the used the DOI as basis for their legal brief.

Eric Holder maintains that the DOJ can investigate itself using an Obama campaign contributor. That is the legal basis for any state to secede today.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Fernando Von Hinke · 2 months ago

Alec, and everyone, thanks for your comments.

I see this is a heated subject.

Regarding the book, I know it's biased as its part of a collection of books I was referred to when looking at Cato Institute and other "libertarian" groups. I am definitely not using this book to study this course, but others more academic I had already gotten when studying a course from the Great Courses company.

Fernando

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Alec D. Rogers · 2 months ago

Thanks Fernando. To be clear, I just wanted to make sure you understood the book had a particular take and one that's not universally accepted, but by all means continue to read it. I'm sure it's well done and it's always good to get another take on the Constitution.

Re the note from "anonymous": please give me a citation to a northern state that believed it had the right to secede. I.e. a resolution passed by a legislature. I know there are a lot of people who claimed this to be the case once aggrieved years later (a case of the losers trying to write the history) but again if it had been contemplated at the time there surely would have been prominent federalists using the possibility as a selling point.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Another consequence of once in always in is this AP story ->

Saying that their info is source from Snowden the AP reports that " spy agencies have a powerful ally in Angry Birds and a host of other apps installed on smartphones across the globe."

↑ -3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Alec, the way to find a source is to use google. Place secession Hartford Convention and you get back wiki and <http://www.sparknotes.com/history/american/warof1812/section8.rhtml>

just ask the general question about the belief of the right of secession and you can find my point. Mai already sent my sources to our professor but didn't hear back from him and likely wont. which is ok, I am sure he is busy. Read my other comments in this thread too and feel free to check them out. .

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Fernando,

regardless of the source ... evidence can speak to what we believe the truth actually is. As David Kendalmsaid at Clinton's impeachment trial. ... every pancake has two sides. I would modify that to every pancake has atleastntwomsides except that would be a messy pancake.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Gayle Morrow · 2 months ago

wiki? seriously?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

cliff notes version.

Here are excerpts from Abe's speech->

Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that by the accession of a Republican Administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. (like Morrill Tax and 600,000 plus deaths later maybe the South had cause for apprehension)

I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.

(so later when he does interfere he admits he had zero authority to do so and this is all about a more perfect union?) (I am not arguing for slavery ... just that the South's rights were trampled by Lincoln and the northern voters who elected him)

Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations and had never recanted them; and more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read: (so why didn't the voters who elected him go into revolt from the Emancipation Declaration? - clearly people posture and have an eye all along on outcomes)

(listen how conservative lincoln sounds when the result of his was is that all power now resides in the central government and virtually all of that power in the hands of Obama):  
*Resolved*, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

(If you lived in the South back then should you trusted these words?)

I now reiterate these sentiments, and in doing so I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section as to another. (like the Morrill Tax was cheerfully imposed on the South by the North but I think cheer to one section was not cheer to another).

(Do you really feel northern congressmen felt restricted by the fugitive slave law? Lincoln says that they are:)

It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the lawgiver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution—to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause "shall be delivered up" their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not with nearly equal unanimity frame and pass a law by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?

(So here is a loathsome agreement and Lincoln says that states ought to be in abidance:)  
 There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by State authority, but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done. And should anyone in any case be content that his oath shall go unkept on a merely unsubstantial controversy as to *how* it shall be kept?

(Note how much difference Lincoln claims he will be versus Obama with his phone and pen

not restricted at all)

I take the official oath to-day with no mental reservations and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any hypercritical rules; and while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed than to violate any of them trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

(Note that the Civil War is the result of what Lincoln implies "Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed" - he states secession has no ruling authority pro or con in writing).

I hold that in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution, and the Union will endure forever, it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

(Lincoln does a stretch here ... let's say you agree to paint my house for \$1,000 and you don't paint it. Am I still bound when you did not perform?)

Again: If the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it—break it, so to speak—but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?

(Note that Lincoln cites the Union starts in 1774 and in the agreement to rules to get out are clearly stated in 1776 - we revolted under those rules)

Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that in legal contemplation the Union is perpetual confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed, in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured, and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was *"to form a more perfect Union."*

(So if one set of states decides to abuse the other then the preservation means you are getting a more perfect union?)

But if destruction of the Union by one or by a part only of the States be lawfully possible, the Union is *less* perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

(Lincoln here gives a self-serving declaration based solely on his POV - the King of England figured we broke his laws too)

It follows from these views that no State upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union; that *resolves* and *ordinances* to that effect are legally void, and that acts of violence within any State or States against the authority of the United States are insurrectionary or



revolutionary, according to circumstances.

Happy to continue the analysis if you are still interested

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Phil R. Bales · 21 days ago

Very thoughtful and thorough analysis, Anonymous. But do wish you'd choose to be identified. It's a little offensive and intimidating to address someone as "anonymous"

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

The left has been taught to attack people rather than discuss ideas.

Consider how many in our government - top to bottom would like to destroy Snowden. A friend from college kept Clinton from being thrown out of office and I helped him several times way back when so I figure I have a chit saved up when they come after me. President Hillary is not going to make a move on me. Protected.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)



Dawn Witzke · 2 months ago

I think the founders left the door open. They had no idea if this new Constitution would work. They might even be shocked that it still exists after 200+ years. I think they were open to scrapping the whole thing and trying something different if it was found to not be working as they did with the Articles of Confederation. Considering that individuals and not politicians that voted it in, it really doesn't matter what the leaders of the states thought on the permanency.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag



Manuel Gutierrez · 2 months ago

I sort of agree with your point Dawn. I think they were well aware of the potential limitations and the volubility of people- such is Franklin's famous remark at the end of the convention, when a lady asks him about what they'd brought and he said "A Republic, madam, if you can keep it"

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Dawn,

The anti-federalists feared dictatorships and mobocracy. Quickly after we formed our nation under the constitution John Adams subjected people to the Alien and Sedition Act which was as bad an idea as living under King George. So he got booted after only one term and in came in TJ for 2 terms.

Jefferson was highly suspicious of central power and his popularity has gone up and down in this nation the opposite of popularity of a strong all powerful central government.

Far from once in, always in ... Jefferson figured we would have an open rebellion every 20 years.

TJ -> explains (God forbid we should ever be 20. years without such a rebellion)

I do not know whether it is to yourself or Mr. Adams I am to give my thanks for the copy of the new constitution. I beg leave through you to place them where due. It will be yet three weeks before I shall receive them from America. There are very good articles in it: and very bad. I do not know which preponderate. What we have lately read in the history of Holland, in the chapter on the Stadtholder, would have sufficed to set me against a Chief magistrate eligible for a long duration, if I had ever been disposed towards one: and what we have always read of the elections of Polish kings should have forever excluded the idea of one continuable for life. Wonderful is the effect of impudent and persevering lying. The British ministry have so long hired their gazetteers to repeat and model into every form lies about our being in anarchy, that the world has at length believed them, the English nation has believed them, the ministers themselves have come to believe them, and what is more wonderful, we have believed them ourselves. Yet where does this anarchy exist? Where did it ever exist, except in the single instance of Massachusetts? And can history produce an instance of a rebellion so honourably conducted? I say nothing of it's motives. They were founded in ignorance, not wickedness. God forbid we should ever be 20. years without such a rebellion.[1] The people can not be all, and always, well informed. The part which is wrong will be discontented in proportion to the importance of the facts they misconceive. If they remain quiet under such misconceptions it is a lethargy, the forerunner of death to the public liberty. We have had 13. states independant 11. years. There has been one rebellion. That comes to one rebellion in a century and a half for each state. What country ever existed a century and a half without a rebellion? And what country can preserve it's liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon and pacify them. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is it's natural manure. Our Convention has been too much impressed by the insurrection of Massachusetts: and in the spur of the moment they are setting up a kite to keep the hen yard in order. I hope in god this article will be rectified before the new constitution is accepted." - [Thomas Jefferson](#) to William Stephens Smith, [Paris](#), 13 Nov. 1787[2]

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Michael Linwood Floyd · 2 months ago 

I personally always believed that the individual states had a right to secede from the Union based on the wording of the Declaration of Independence, but if you go by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Texas v. White*, 74 U.S. 700 (1869) the Supreme Court ruled that Texas had remained a state ever since it first joined the Union, even though it joined the CSA. The court held that the Constitution did not permit states to unilaterally secede from the United States, and that all decisions allowing secession by state legislatures were null and void.

Now, as a born Southerner from the home state of Thomas Jefferson I believe that the individual states should reserve the right to secede from the Union in certain cases. It should also be noted that during reconstruction the southern states were "occupied territory" and although the Federal government stated that they had remained a part of the Union, they were also required to make changes in order to be "allowed" back into the Union... Seems like a bit of confusion there. Either you are in, or you're not, but you can't be both in and out...


But, it's situations like this that remind me (from my business law classes) that the answer to every legal question is "That depends..."

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Rebecca Hahn · a month ago 

I had always held that the states could secede because of that clause in the Declaration of Independence. However, our government is of the people, by the people, and for the people. Doesn't that make the whole idea of throwing off a government a non-issue? Who are you going to revolt against? Yourself?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 

>However, our government is of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Consider that slavery ended peacefully around the world and only exists in a few backward cultures today and then consider if a government that produced Antietam is of the people, by the people, and for the people.



### Casualty Does Not Equal Dead

Casualties include three categories: 1) dead; 2) wounded; and 3) missing or captured. In general terms, casualties of Civil War battles included 20% dead and 80% wounded. Of the soldiers who were wounded, about one out of seven died from his wounds. Over 2/3 of the 622,000 men who gave their lives in the Civil War died from disease, not from battle.

### Antietam Casualties

Approximate Numbers	Union	Confederate	Total
Killed	2,100	1,550	3,650
Wounded	9,550	7,750	17,300
Missing/Captured	750	1,020	1,770
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,400</b>	<b>10,320</b>	<b>22,720</b>



↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

You mean it ended peacefully for who? The Slave owners? White people? Not for the Slaves would it have been peacefully.

The Continuation of Slavery would continue the vilest, immoral and, as practiced in America, racist practices against one set of people based on the color of their skin, as well as the fact Southerners believed they were property, not human beings. Sub-humans who had no rights. (Thank you son of Texas, Ted Nugent)

They could continue to beat them, rape them and kill them, pretty much as they continued to do under Jim Crow laws after the war.

Mr. Anonymous, why don't you say what you really mean: Fewer white people would be killed.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

many on the left condemn Truman for dropping the bomb on Japan. a heck, they blame white

people for all the evil of the world. communist meme sin ww II. the idea is that Lincoln instigated the war by sending war ships to collect an unfair tax and the tax was on the South to benefit the North. nowhere else in the world did such violence ever take place and that includes the violence against slaves by their white slave masters.

our prof blames hot heads in South Carolina but they were provoked by a president who got 40% of the vote. this is not forming a more perfect union. though we all agree slavery was evil and should be stopped. This was one side conquering another via military might.

What went out the window with this war was our freedom. go back and look at the video of how long our prof discussed the 10th Amendment. Even Roberts said the commerce clause was not legal to use to make us buy a product.

Even Jonathan Turley has said our president is violating the constitution. And descendants of slaves vote one party and have no freedom as a consequence.

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 21 days ago 🔗

Truman saved an estimated one million GIs by dropping the bomb. His own party had wanted to replace him with Ike because they thought he was incompetent. I can't remember in my 65 years once having anybody in America liberal or otherwise say we shouldn't have dropped the bomb on the Japanese.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago 🔗

I can't remember until this thread anyone saying that Lincoln attacked the South by collecting taxes at Ft. Sumter. Or that it is all the USA fault the South was not left alone to peacefully practice Slavery -- free from taxation.

This is thread has become truly "fringe".

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago 🔗

Anonymous wrote: >>>> ***nowhere else in the world did such violence ever take place and that includes the violence against slaves by their white slave masters.***

Whoa!! While the Civil War was tragic and bloody, you are not even close in your assertions: just google war deaths or google slave deaths..

some citations below --

World War I deaths: **37 million**

[http://www.pbs.org/greatwar/resources/casdeath\\_pop.html](http://www.pbs.org/greatwar/resources/casdeath_pop.html)

World War II deaths: **63 million**

<http://www.secondworldwarhistory.com/world-war-2-statistics.asp>

Or by battles: Then type in the battles of the Somme, Cannae, Stalingrad

You really are **way off** the mark.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

The bloodiest single day in American military history (Antietam) ended in a draw, but the Confederate retreat gave Abraham Lincoln the "victory" he desired before issuing the Emancipation Proclamation.

Although Lincoln proclaimed he had no legal right to emancipate slavery in the South he used the slaughter of fellow Americans to violate his own belief - in order to create a more "perfect union" (by force).

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

> can't remember until this thread anyone saying that Lincoln attacked the South by collecting taxes at Ft. Sumpter.

Sumnter.

Not recalling (personal knowledge) is not the way to measure things to decide if facts are fringe or real. The North RAISED the tax rate because they had more people in congress to pass the law. Lincoln sent war ships to S Carolina in order to provoke them into action.

See the movie Emperor - <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt2103264/>

Made in 2012 with Matthew Fox as General Fellers and Tommy Lee Jones as Gen Douglass MacArthur. - The issue was whether or not to hang the Emperor of Japan right after WWII.

From the Japanese POV FDR provoked them into Pearl Harbor by cutting off their supply of petroleum from SE Asia. So we think from our POV the attack was unprovoked, from their they saw it otherwise. Researching Fellers you find out he was in N Africa and sending encoded messages that the Germans were intercepting so Rommel kept defeating every move the Brits made. Then what stands out in the research is that when Fellers suspected his messages were being intercepted by the Germans our State Dept ORDERED Fellers to keep using the system.

We had communists like Alger Hiss highly placed at State at the time but I could not find out who it was who order Fellers to keep using a system he felt was compromised. So I wrote to a



prof who was in the KGB spy files weeks after Gorbachev was forced out at the head of the USSR. He had no direct knowledge who it was that ordered Fellers to keep using a system that was compromised.

When we broke the German "Enigma" code one of the first, if not the first, messages the Brits decoded was a message from Fellers back to the USA that the Germans had decoded. So Churchill immediately told FDR to jerk Fellers and State then had him change the encryption system. That was the end if the genius tactical moves of Rommel.

There are more and more details that are interesting to me ... like his daughter (the daughter of Fellers) dated William F. Buckley and Fellers introduced Buckley around in the right wing in DC. Fellers was a founder of the John Birch Society ... so i don't think he was trying to advance the cause of the USSR by having the Nazis chew up Brits in Africa. He aided the Nazis without knowing.

All this is to show you that there is a heck of a lot you don't know and just because you aren't aware of facts. I didn't know about Fellers and why Rommel had so much success in Africa before watching this movie and then doing the research.

A huge number of Americans are aware that with John Mayer ... again and that Miley Cyrus wore an outfit the other day with a design of a marijuana leaf on it and that pilots of Justin Bieber's jet had to wear masks because there was so much marijuana smoke in the plane ... that is the measure of being fringe or not ... facts are Lincoln intended to enforce a punitive tax on the South by force.

As to what is fringe and what isn't ->

tell me what was the tax rate on tea that caused the Boston Tea Party?

How was government of the USA paid for before 1861?

What was the name of the tax that the congress had just passed on right before Lincoln was sworn in as president.

What was the rate of this tax?

What was the cause of the Whiskey Rebellion of 1791?

Have you ever heard of the term "taxation without representation"?

Did Romney catch heat from the left when he pointed out that 47% of the voting population of the USA are tax takers?

Is the 10th Amendment still law in the USA/

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

Michael:

>Truman saved an estimated one million GIs by dropping the bomb.



Check out the movie "Emperor" <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt2103264/>

MacArthur saved the Japanese people from horrible pathways we can imagine by sparing the life of the Emperor. Communist agent Harry Dexter White provoked Japan into attacking the USA instead of the closer USSR by getting FDR to cut off their liquid fuel supplies several months prior.

I have heard all sorts of leftists here in the USA say we were immoral for dropping A bombs on Japan. Like we could have dropped the bomb in Tokyo to prove a point. But taking your idea and seeing who is right I found these quotes (not from the left -- these guys were our military leaders at the time:

<http://www.washingtonsblog.com/2012/10/the-real-reason-america-used-nuclear-weapons-against-japan-to...>

**from the article -> In my opinion, the Japanese war was really won before we ever used the atom bomb.** Thus, it wouldn't have been necessary for us to disclose our nuclear position and stimulate the Russians to develop the same thing much more rapidly than they would have if we had not dropped the bomb.

Actually Russia did not have the physical means or the science to make a nuclear bomb at the end of WWII. Were not pursuing the technology and they could not have developed it in the short period from our using in Japan and their first test (Aug 29 1949). Harry Hopkins sent them the material they needed for the bomb through lend lease and the Rosenbergs gave them the design. Elizabeth Bentley was in the loop with the Rosenbergs - tangentially. She is the one who outed Harry Dexter White - who created the IMF and gave our engraved plates for creating our currency to Stalin so he could finance the Soviet occupying eastern europe after WWII. White also kept Chaing Kai-shek from getting a huge loan congress had authorized to keep Mao from taking over China post WWII.

Historians think that just because Hopkins sent U-238 to Russia that it can not be turned into a bomb and thus excuse Hopkins. Wrong. They don't know nuclear physics. Their first bomb was made of plutonium, not U-235 (product of gaseous diffusion using the difference in weights of uranium hexaflouride 235 and uranium hexaflouride (what Iran is working on right now thanks the green light from Obama and Kerry).

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soviet\\_atomic\\_bomb\\_project](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soviet_atomic_bomb_project) is a source of disinformation ... no mention of uranium shipped from the USA to Russia via lend lease.

See: <http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Government/2013/09/09/The-Rebuttal-Part-Three>

This became a war between Diana West and Ron Radosh/David Horowitz with Harvey Klehr siding in with team Radosh. I've known David and Harvey for some time and what set me off waw when Radosh exonerated Harry Hopkins claiming U238 could not be turned into a bomb so Hopkins was not yet another communist agent working for Soviet interests from inside our government. Indeed U238 can be turned into a fissionable bomb in the form of plutonium but

Radosh and Klehr didn't know the science.

So even as Boris Yeltsin invited Harvey into all the KGB files of how the Soviets totally penetrated our government and do so in our culture today via history professors and guys like Oliver Stone/Hollywood types Harvey did not have command of all the facts. So we still don't have the whole picture. And Harvey's works have been totally ripped by almost all historians and it was only when there was a one to one link with the CIA declassifying the Venona Papers did they leave Harvey alone ... so influenced by Marxism are the people in charge of what we know and don't know about American history.

Good place to start:

## American Betrayal: The Secret Assault on Our Nation's Character Hardcover

by [Diana West](#) (Author) <http://www.amazon.com/American-Betrayal-Assault-Nations-Character/dp/0312630786>

In *American Betrayal*, West digs deeper to discover the root of this malaise and uncovers a body of lies that Americans have been led to regard as the near-sacred history of World War II and its Cold War aftermath.

## In Denial: Historians, Communism, and Espionage Paperback

by [John Earl Haynes](#) (Author) , [Harvey Klehr](#) (Author)  
<http://www.amazon.com/In-Denial-Historians-Communism-Espionage/dp/159403088X>

What we see repeated over and over here on this forum is people whose opinions have been shaped by an extreme left POV and they aren't aware of it.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 20 days ago 🔒

More Shoe banging on desk rants --- good grief!!!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 20 days ago

Groucho Marx must have been thinking of this discussion when he said:

"There is no Sanity Clause."

Apologies to Groucho.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



Alec D. Rogers · 2 months ago

Michael - we'll be talking a LOT about reconstruction in this class. In his book, Amar addresses the anomaly of how the former confederate states were treated at different stages and what it means for the 13, 14 15th amendments in particular.

The White decision doesn't strike me as having any real value. What was it going to say about the deaths of so many soldiers? Sorry US - the CSA DID have a right to please. Please pay them \$500 billion in damages and let them leave? If the CSA had won, the Court's ruling wouldn't have mattered.

In short, the judiciary simply has nothing to say of any import on this question. It's one reserved to others in the government and in the end, this constitutional issues was settled by the Union Army.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Linwood Floyd · 2 months ago

Hi Alec, thanks for your reply...

Yes, I also thought the White Decision didn't have that much value as it was basically a dispute over money. But lawyers, law students, and the general populace seem to have accepted that decision as "proof" that secession is illegal.

Like I said, I tend to believe the Declaration of Independence when it says the people have a right and duty to throw off abusive government.

As far as the "more perfect Union," It could be said that a Union could be made "more perfect" by allowing those who want to leave to do so. :-)

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Alec D. Rogers · 2 months ago

Americans at the time were of course influenced by Locke, who spoke of a natural right to overthrow a government than is not serving its legitimate purposes. The Articles of Confederation said they were permanent. But of course they were thrown to the curb by the

Ratification vote. You can't legislate permanence. You can only create a country where people want to live.

As Lincoln pointed out, though, preserving the Union wasn't about one country - it was about the question of whether self-government was a sustainable concept. If you read [Gary Gallagher's The Union War](#), he goes into how important this really was for ordinary Americans at the time we can't fathom today.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [2 months ago](#) 🔒

1863 - 87 = 1776.

So lincoln based the formation of the nation on the principles outlined in the Declaration of Independence rather than the Constitution. And the DOI lays down the fact that our rights either flow from the Creator and Locke points out or the government.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

[HJ](#) · [2 months ago](#) 🔒

The Professor explained the "United States" was an attempt to follow the Act of Union between England and Scotland in 1707. This was meant to be a permanent Union. Next year the Scots will vote in a referendum as to whether they should leave the Union. What is the difference?

The problem with discussing such issues is that the Civil War means emotion affects the issue. What would the position be if Hawaii wanted to leave the Union? Very few borders have remained for ever (see **Vanished Kingdoms: The History of Half-Forgotten Europe** by Norman Davies). Is the USA "exceptional" in this??

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [21 days ago](#) 🔒

>What would the position be if Hawaii wanted to leave the Union?

Many do. Puerto Ricans wanting out of control by the USA shot up the congress and Clinton gave pardons to Puerto Rican terrorists in order to give Hillary PR votes for her senate run. The freeing of these terrorists was to make a more perfect union.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

[Michael Scott](#) Signature Track · [21 days ago](#) 🔒

It is amazing how nothing in the comments needs to be even remotely true. We could sure

could us a fact check application to monitor the posts especially coming from Anonymous posters. I used to work at one of our plants in Puerto Rico. There are three schools of thought on the future of Puerto Rico. The two biggest groups split 50/50 either want statehood or stay as a possession. The smallest group wants to be independent.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago 🔒

>It is amazing how nothing in the comments needs to be even remotely true

and

>We could sure could us a fact check application to monitor the posts especially coming from Anonymous posters.

The second of two **assassination attempts on U.S. President Harry S. Truman** occurred on November 1, 1950.[1] It was carried out by two [Puerto Rican pro-independence activists](#), [Oscar Collazo](#) and [Griselio Torresola](#), while the President resided at the [Blair House](#). Torresola mortally wounded [White House Police](#) officer [Leslie Coffelt](#), who killed him in return fire. Secret Service agents also were involved and wounded Collazo. [President Harry S. Truman](#) was not harmed.[2]

wiki

What people don't realize is what they believe is filtered for content to get people to support the Democrat Party. Historians in colleges and universities are virtually 100% on the left. Our media does not go after OBAMA on Fast and Furious, Benghazi, Obamacare causing deaths and its many problems, our government using the IRS to suppress political opposition.

From and:

Dr. Carson himself became the subject of an IRS audit after criticizing Barack Obama's policies at the annual National Prayer Breakfast in Washington last year.

"I've always been someone who has been very careful about my finances and the way I take care of my business," said Dr. Carson. "I've never undergone this kind of scrutiny before, but then it comes after the prayer breakfast. They're harassing my family. They're harassing my colleagues. And they're not finding anything – so that just makes them dig a little deeper."

Read more at <http://www.wnd.com/2014/02/ben-carson-obama-officials-acting-like-gestapo/#AF4X2X1hjwLksWFr.99>

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · 21 days ago 🔒

See you have excellent examples of how far in the weeds you will go. I don't even remember 1950 because I was only two years old. I did hear about old Harry but what does he have to do with Hillary?

You must have way too much time on your hands. Are you one of those phony 9/11 disability recipients from New York City they are just now catching?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 21 days ago

the issue was why I don't use my name. these comments are viewed and lists are made. I am just telling the spooks reading my opinion I have protection from their boss.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



Alec D. Rogers · 2 months ago

HJ, I'd say we need to distinguish between a situation where a region "devolves" (perhaps not even a state - there's nothing magical about state borders when it comes to this question) from the US and one where it unilaterally claims the right to leave. I think Prof Amar is denying that a state could simply pick up and leave without the others' permission in some form. That's entirely different from saying that the US could never conceivably give up a territory through lawful means.

For instance, Scotland isn't saying "we're voting on leaving and there's nothing you can do about it if we choose to go." In fact, this vote was established under applicable British law. It's nothing like the situation in the US in 1861.

Perhaps the next constitutional amendment will establish a means of leaving the US? Given all of the divide into "red" and "blue" states maybe some part of the country will wish to leave and we'll need to figure out how that can be done amicably. But that's something to settle through the political process.

If Hawaii wanted to leave, it would in my view need to make its wishes known and perhaps try to repeal the Act of Congress making it a state? If that wasn't sufficient we'd probably need a constitutional amendment to clarify how to handle the situation. But Hawaii isn't free to say "we're out of here on our own" (oh, and thanks for all the federal \$\$\$ building up our facilities!)

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

If Hawaii listed its case as was done in 1776 then certainly they can leave. In fact a lot of them want to go.

Puerto Rico is a great example. They can leave if they want to and the Phillipines use to be

US territory. No longer. There was a move once to have Cuba be included as a state in the Union but it was blocked by the North. And Northern states discussed secession at the hartford convention.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Alec D. Rogers · 2 months ago

And what precisely would they state as their bill of complaint? Recall that MOST of the DOI is a list of what GB had done to the colonies in violation of their rights as Englishmen. And in order to enforce it, the patriots had to fight and win a war against GB. I've never visited HI, and I'm not sure how many = "a lot". I recall when I worked in Congress there was a lot of talk re Puerto Rico. About 1/3 wanted to become a state, 1/3 wanted to leave, and 1/3 wanted the status quo.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

>And what precisely would they state as their bill of complaint?  
from ... note the year of 1852 when S Carolina was listing complaints of the violation of the Constitution, well before the Civil War.

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/csa\\_scarsec.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/csa_scarsec.asp)

The people of the State of South Carolina, in Convention assembled, on the 26th day of April, A.D., 1852, declared that the frequent violations of the [Constitution of the United States](#), by the Federal Government, and its encroachments upon the reserved rights of the States, fully justified this State in then withdrawing from the Federal Union; but in deference to the opinions and wishes of the other slaveholding States, she forbore at that time to exercise this right. Since that time, these encroachments have continued to increase, and further forbearance ceases to be a virtue.

and

In pursuance of this [Declaration of Independence](#), each of the thirteen States proceeded to exercise its separate sovereignty; adopted for itself a Constitution, and appointed officers for the administration of government in all its departments-- Legislative, Executive and Judicial. For purposes of defense, they united their arms and their counsels; and, in 1778, they entered into a League known as the [Articles of Confederation](#), whereby they agreed to entrust the administration of their external relations to a common agent, known as the Congress of the United States, expressly declaring, in the [first Article](#) "that each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right which is not, by this Confederation, expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled."

Under this Confederation the war of the Revolution was carried on, and on the 3rd of September, 1783, the contest ended, and a [definite Treaty](#) was signed by Great Britain, in which she acknowledged the independence of the Colonies in the following terms: "[ARTICLE](#)

1-- His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz: New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, to be FREE, SOVEREIGN AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that he treats with them as such; and for himself, his heirs and successors, relinquishes all claims to the government, propriety and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof."

(So freedom was not done as a collective and thus earning collective rights fas Lincoln claimed and is claimed today)

Thus were established the two great principles asserted by the Colonies, namely: the right of a State to govern itself; and the right of a people to abolish a Government when it becomes destructive of the ends for which it was instituted. And concurrent with the establishment of these principles, was the fact, that each Colony became and was recognized by the mother Country a FREE, SOVEREIGN AND INDEPENDENT STATE.

and (consider who pays attention to the 10th Amendment today except maybe Clarence Thomas and look how he is demonized by the left.)

By this [Constitution](#), certain duties were imposed upon the several States, and the exercise of certain of their powers was restrained, which necessarily implied their continued existence as sovereign States. But to remove all doubt, an [amendment](#) was added, which declared that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people. On the 23d May , 1788, South Carolina, by a Convention of her People, passed an Ordinance assenting to this Constitution, and afterwards altered her own Constitution, to conform herself to the obligations she had undertaken.

and (not arguing for the fugitive slave law but note how lincoln decided he could take this power away from states in his first inaugural - who gave him that right?)

The Constitution of the United States, in its [fourth Article](#), provides as follows: "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up, on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."

This stipulation was so material to the compact, that without it that compact would not have been made. The greater number of the contracting parties held slaves, and they had previously evinced their estimate of the value of such a stipulation by making it a condition in the [Ordinance](#) for the government of the territory ceded by Virginia, which now composes the States north of the Ohio River.

The same [article of the Constitution](#) stipulates also for rendition by the several States of



fugitives from justice from the other States.

(So Lincoln shred to Constitution. Not arguing to bring back slavery, I would not want to be a slave either ... just looking at the counts the South had against Lincoln and the North as you requested).

More detail on how the Constitution was being violated:

The General Government, as the common agent, passed laws to carry into effect these stipulations of the States. For many years these laws were executed. But an increasing hostility on the part of the non-slaveholding States to the institution of slavery, has led to a disregard of their obligations, and the laws of the General Government have ceased to effect the objects of the Constitution. The States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa, have enacted laws which either nullify the Acts of Congress or render useless any attempt to execute them. In many of these States the fugitive is discharged from service or labor claimed, and in none of them has the State Government complied with the stipulation made in the Constitution. The State of New Jersey, at an early day, passed a law in conformity with her constitutional obligation; but the current of anti-slavery feeling has led her more recently to enact laws which render inoperative the remedies provided by her own law and by the laws of Congress. In the State of New York even the right of transit for a slave has been denied by her tribunals; and the States of Ohio and Iowa have refused to surrender to justice fugitives charged with murder, and with inciting servile insurrection in the State of Virginia. Thus the constituted compact has been deliberately broken and disregarded by the non-slaveholding States, and the consequence follows that South Carolina is released from her obligation.

Pretty much in line with the POV of the DOI if you look at the original rules as written:

We affirm that these ends for which this Government was instituted have been defeated, and the Government itself has been made destructive of them by the action of the non-slaveholding States. Those States have assume the right of deciding upon the propriety of our domestic institutions; and have denied the rights of property established in fifteen of the States and recognized by the [Constitution](#); they have denounced as sinful the institution of slavery; they have permitted open establishment among them of societies, whose avowed object is to disturb the peace and to eloin the property of the citizens of other States. They have encouraged and assisted thousands of our slaves to leave their homes; and those who remain, have been incited by emissaries, books and pictures to servile insurrection.

For twenty-five years this agitation has been steadily increasing, until it has now secured to its aid the power of the common Government. Observing the **forms** of the [Constitution](#), a sectional party has found within that [Article](#) establishing the Executive Department, the means of subverting the Constitution itself. A geographical line has been drawn across the Union, and all the States north of that line have united in the election of a man to the high office of President of the United States, whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery. He is to

be entrusted with the administration of the common Government, because he has declared that that "Government cannot endure permanently half slave, half free," and that the public mind must rest in the belief that slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Miriam Kerzner · 2 months ago

The Supreme Court was still functioning and had a majority of southern justices. That ought to have been a preliminary step, just as it is today. You may disagree with the outcome, but as long as the process is still functioning as intended, secession was unjustified.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Dear Anon:

"South Carolina is too small for a nation and too large for an insane asylum."

----- Hon.James L. Petigru, South Carolina politician, 1860

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

SCOTUS did not prevent the long and detailed abuses the South got from the North. Lincoln ignored the Dred Scott ruling. However horrible it favored property rights of the South. Back then wealth was in part measured in the South by the numbers and quality of their slaves. Northerners then were taking Southern property with zero compensation to the slave owners. The North wanted to end slavery and thus create a huge loss in value to the South.

Plus the North passed the Morrill Act whose sole function was to tax the South and send the money North. The modern Democrat Party is skilled at taking money from others and buying votes with everyone's money. that is why big government democrats claim once in always in, rationalizes vote buying by democrat party special interests.

Nothing has changed. Back then there was an actual evil to oppose in slavery. Now big government democrats demonize "the rich" in order to legitimize stealing their money.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Miriam Kerzner · 2 months ago

Actually, Republican states, on average, take more from the federal government than do Democratic states so it's the Republicans that seem to be especially skilled at taking money from others. That simply makes the Democrats inept.

<http://neweconomicperspectives.org/2012/11/how-the-takers-voted.html#more-3769>

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Check out which states have the highest tax rates. All Democrat. Check out all the failing big cities - all run by Democrats. High tax leftist states should be called Red states but that would be too obvious.

World Communism celebrates their day on May 1st in memory of Chicago's Haymarket Riot of 1886.

<http://archive.frontpagemag.com/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=23017> Half of Marxist terrorist Big Bill Haywood's ashes are buried at the Kremlin and half in Chicago near the Haymarket memorial.

The left today has zero idea how much Marxism influences their world view - no knowledge of history - no idea that Red Emma Goldman stabbed Frick etc. Read more about Big Bill at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bill\\_Haywood](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bill_Haywood). He spent his final years in the Soviet Union.

↑ -3 ↓ · flag

Miriam Kerzner · 2 months ago

The R states can afford to have lower tax rates because they sponge off the federal government -- just like Walmart.

Highest welfare rates, SNAP rates, EITC claimants, etc.... all in R states. They don't want to tax themselves or pay their service sectors a living wage, so they "steal", as you put it, from the blue states.

And if you're going to talk about failing, then you also need to account for obesity and stress related death rates, poverty rates, poor educational achievement rates, divorce rates, and teen pregnancy rates -- all of which are significantly worse in the Old South than elsewhere.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Alec D. Rogers · 2 months ago

This thread has clearly run its course.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

ANON.

**Justice Taney** wrote in the Dred Scott decision (making this the law of the land) that blacks:

***"had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. He was bought and sold and treated as an ordinary article of merchandise and traffic, whenever profit could be made by it."***

People are not property except to the morally bankrupt. The Southern Plantation owners were not plain, simple businessmen to be left alone to go about their business. The southern society was built around the words Taney put into law and every American should rejoice in the overthrow of the corrupt, immoral society that existed in the South before the war.

WWII was not fought about how the Germans treated the Jews, yet the Holocaust was ended and the remaining Jews that The Western allies could reach were saved.

Even if the Civil War was not about Slavery (which no thinking person on this list will concede), all Americans should rejoice that the Southern Aristocracy was overthrown and Slavery ended by the XIII Amendment. And that the XIV and XV amendments overturned Taney's horrid caselaw.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago 🔒

Miriam,

The federal government is the one stealing from others to buy votes for the Democrat Party and special interest of Republicans. It creates nothing and all its employees work off the sweat of the brow of other Americans. I shop at Walmart because they have low prices. The government pays \$600 for a toilet seat or a hammer. We are only different from the old USSR in that our private sector produced so much faster than government we had more freedom and could stay ahead of government destroying everything it touches,

But under our current leadership the desire is to "spread around the wealth" as Obama said to Joe the Plumber over 5 years ago. As a consequence of his policies and the fact the government has been able to shake down every business of any size our economy has stalled, the % of the population on food stamps is at an all time high and unemployment remains high as business realizes how many people there are that are trained by our education system to hate them.

Marxism is pretty simple - he laid it out ->

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence:  
Abolition of private property.

<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/ch02.htm>

This is exactly why the rich are being demonized today. Gives an excuse to steal their stuff.

Deploy Marxist ideas into our culture - the system Gramsci figured out - capture all the institutions.

↑ -3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago 🔒

Anon,

Back then people were considered property by some and the agreement to form the nation recognized that fact. The North stole property of the South from their POV and John Brown tried to get uprising by slaves to their master would be killed.

>The southern society was built around the words Taney put into law and every American should rejoice in the overthrow of the corrupt, immoral society that existed in the South before the war.

Actually the ideal we were created on is based on the idea of John Locke. That our rights are individual and not because you are a member of a group. Our rights flow from the Creator and not from government and these rights according to Locke were life, liberty and property.

If you go back to what Lincoln said in his first inaugural address ... everything you posted he rejected and he was largely speaking to the South.

Keep your slaves and pay your taxes was his message. What isn't address in his speech is that the North passed the Morrill Tax ... the point of which was to take money from the South and send it North. Ft. Sumter was where they collected taxes in the South for the federal government. That is why the war started there. And Lincoln more or less was spoiling for the war. When studying history it is important not to judge the past based on today's world views. Lincoln's solution was to ship Blacks back to Liberia and Frederick Douglass rejected that. BTW ... Sherman is my favorite Seahawk.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Mark Nisson · 2 months ago 🔒

Well, Anonymous, with this post you've finally clarified the issue of whether individual states can secede. Thanks for keeping this thread close to the topic and resisting the temptation to pollute it with partisan gibberish. (I'm referring to the "Anonymous" who responded to Miriam.)

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



J.R. Sedivy · 2 months ago 🔒

You raise a really interesting point concerning Civil War. Considering this perspective states wishing to secede were fighting a battle similar to the Revolutionary War - a war for independence as opposed to control. There's a world of difference here.

I am also having difficulty with the never being able to disengage from "the more perfect Union" aspect. In business I could not see the rationale of entering into a contract in perpetuity - in essence you would be giving up all your leverage and power to a group who you are then at the mercy of - forever. Times change. Circumstances change. Those in power change. A contract or union may be advantageous to me today, but may be detrimental tomorrow. One must maintain the ability to exit.

When making the comparison between a merger and acquisition in business the founders of a company are usually rewarded handsomely and exit (usually within a year) just to ensure a smooth transition. I could not imagine a situation where a company founder or founders would lock themselves down in perpetuity by entering a contract to stay at the acquiring company without an end and forgoing their freedom of choice to exit.

Would the delegates of each respective state really lock down their citizens to a greater power in perpetuity just having broken free of the British Crown? Although the Federalists never explicitly stated that states were free to leave I am not sure it can be said that omission doesn't necessarily imply forgoing this key ability forever especially with a people who value freedom so highly.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag



Alec D. Rogers · 2 months ago

I could not imagine a situation where a company founder or founders would lock themselves down in perpetuity by entering a contract to stay at the acquiring company without an end and forgoing their freedom of choice to exit.

Actually once you're acquired by selling your company to another, it IS perpetual. At least until they sell it back, and there's no obligation to do so.

Circumstances can change, but you need to renegotiate. You can't just say "here: take back your \$ and we'll just go back to the way things were" (unless there's some explicit clause saying you have an option to do so).

You can leave the company just as someone is free to emigrate from the US to Canada or elsewhere. But you can't take the company's property with you.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

JR.

Lots of people think the 3/5th rule of counting Blacks as 3/5th of a person was a bigoted idea created in the South. Actually it was a Northern idea because the count of all people - Black, White, women and men - would have given more votes to the South so the North didn't want to come into the Union being so outvoted. So the agreement was to make things equal so one side did not out vote the other and they could come together to resist aggression from

european powers.

What happened after the signing of the Constitution Eli Whitney invented interchangeable parts and business boomed in the North so they could out vote the South. Lincoln claimed to represent the entire Union but he did not even one time step into a southern state in his first presidential campaign.

Two of his main points:

1. **Slavery:** Lincoln stated emphatically that he had "...no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so."
1. **Use of force:** Lincoln promised that there would be no use of force against the South, unless it proved necessary for him to fulfill his obligation to "hold, occupy, and possess the property and places" belonging to the federal government, and to collect legal duties and imposts. However, if the South chose to actively take up arms against the Government, their insurrection would meet a firm and forceful response.

Before Lincoln took office in March the Northerners in congress passed the Morrill Tax over the desires of the South so they got the upper hand. Tax the South and spend the money in the North.

So where the 3/5ths clause was an attempt to be 50/50 with power once the North got the upper hand that desire for a more perfect union went out the window.

We see the same thing today. On the business side - Citizens United means corporations have unlimited funding opportunity to influence elections and laws that favor just them and Obama gives out every freebie in the world to buy votes for his party and himself. Each side is working really hard to get the upper hand on the other. An ordinary citizen who just wants to be left alone and not have his tax money taken to support the purchasing of votes or corporations protecting their needs against him has about zero power.

We see the Tea Party rise up against it and its natural home is in the Republican Party ... just like opposition to slavery naturally fit there in 1861. But today the chamber of commerce and the likes of Karl Rove are doing all that they can to suppress the Tea Party and it has close to zero leadership capability speaking for it. Every other voter seems bought off one way or the other. Teachers unions create poorly educated kids and no one can get fired for their turning out a lousy product.

Foreign competition keeps auto makers from turning out lousy product but during the time before the rise of imports they were sliding and turning out mediocre product and NIH dominated their thinking. See the movie Tucker and also the one where the auto makers ripped off the guy who created intermittent wipers that responded to water on the windshield -

## Flash of Genius

↑ -1 ↓ · flag



J.R. Sedivy · 2 months ago

Alec - You make an interesting point concerning the acquisition of property and assets especially given the ability of the people to emigrate. In this light perhaps the Constitution did specify an arrangement in perpetuity (land, assets, etc.) without locking down the freedom of the people. Thanks for clarifying.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

A post was deleted

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Better take on the 3/5th rule. It benefitted the North  
wiki:

The **Three-Fifths Compromise** was a compromise between [Southern](#) and [Northern states](#) reached during the [Philadelphia Convention](#) of 1787 in which three-fifths of the enumerated population of [slaves](#) would be counted for [representation](#) purposes regarding both the distribution of taxes and the [apportionment](#) of the members of the [United States House of Representatives](#). It was proposed by delegates [James Wilson](#) and [Roger Sherman](#).

The principle that representation in the House of Representatives would be in proportion to the relative state populations was unanimously accepted. However, since slaves could not vote, [slave states](#) would thus have the benefit of increased representation in the [House](#) and the [Electoral College](#). Delegates opposed to [slavery](#) proposed that only free inhabitants of each state be counted for apportionment purposes, while delegates supportive of slavery, on the other hand, opposed the proposal, wanting slaves to count in their actual numbers. A compromise which was finally agreed upon of counting "*all other persons*" as only three-fifths of their actual numbers reduced the representation of the slave states relative to the original proposals, but improved it over the Northern position.<sup>[1]</sup> An inducement for slave states to accept the Compromise was its tie to taxation in the same ratio, so that the burden of taxation on the slave states was also reduced.

The Three-Fifths Compromise is found in Article 1, Section 2, Paragraph 3 of the [United States Constitution](#) which reads:

Representatives and direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including [those bound to Service for a Term of Years](#), and excluding [Indians](#) not taxed, **three fifths of all other Persons**.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Miriam Kerzner · 2 months ago

You misunderstand the entry. The 3/5 compromise was an improvement for the slave states



over the initial position of the free states.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago 

Suppose the Black population was counted for the number of congressmen a state got in the House ...the South would have had more votes and could have voted all new states in the Union as slave states. As soon as the North got the edge in population they used that to get rid of slavery. So the 3/5th compromise allowed power sharing until the North got the upper hand. Once the North got the upper hand they chose to tax the South and send the tax money North.

Taxing people to support one group at the expense of another one and then having a rebellion as a consequence was not new in American when the Morrill Tax triggered the Civil War.

Hamilton loved power in the central government so he got a tax on whiskey because the farmers who used spare grain to create whisky did not have the voting power to stop the idea from becoming law. Top down control is always what a strong central government advocate is seeking. Was taxation without local representation ... same as we fought with the British.

Plus the western farmers were not given protection from Indian attacks so their needs were ignored yet they were expected to pay for needs Hamilton thought was needed.

So as great as Washington was he came down on farmers resisting the tax with a ton of bricks - used 13,000 militia to put down fellow Americans who were singled out as a group to pay taxes that were to be used given to others. Veterans who fought with Washington and made whiskey said that they fought the British over taxation. I think the Boston Tea Party was only a tax on tea of maybe 2% ... someone can correct me on the rate but it was tiny. When TJ and his party came to office the tax was revoked.

BTW ... Jefferson thought one of his greatest mistakes was not opposing Hamilton's assuming the debt incurred when America was under British rule. We have had a debt ever since.

Interestingly the whiskey producing farmers held a convention to revoke the law. Meaning these guys who lived in the North did not feel that federal power trumped state issues.

From wiki:

At Braddock's Field, there was talk of declaring independence from the United States, and of joining with Spain or Great Britain. Radicals flew a specially designed flag that proclaimed their independence. The flag had six stripes, one for each county represented at the gathering: five Pennsylvania counties (Allegheny, Bedford, Fayette, Washington, and Westmoreland) and one Virginia county (Ohio County).[72]

This is right after the signing of the Constitution and in the North. So these whiskey guys who got taxed to support Hamilton's desire take their money and put it into the pocket of the rich (pay off loans) sure did not agree that once in always in. Boston Tea Party, Whiskey

Rebellions and the Morrill Tax - all prompted armed rebellion against the central power. From wiki:

"Meanwhile, Hamilton began publishing essays under the name of "Tully" in Philadelphia newspapers, denouncing mob violence in western Pennsylvania and advocating military action." So he gets them taxed and then advocated military action to put down the rebellion - all we are saying is give peace a chance?

Check out the government headquarters in Dublin. No windows. The British taxes sunlight.

We currently have a TV show on moonshining and the issue is still taxation.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

wiki? again?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Miriam Kerzner · 2 months ago

Immediately after the DOI you had a collection of independent or sovereign countries (states) that agreed to work together militarily and economically. Ratifying the Constitution meant that states accepted giving up sovereignty to the federal government and giving themselves secondary status. This is why the Anti-Federalists objected so much and insisted on a Bill of Rights that was initially a Bill of Rights for the states limiting the sovereignty that they were actually ceding to the federal government.

The only way to secede that is even **hinted** at is in Article IV, section 3: Congress and the other states would have to agree.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Miriam,

The DOI outlines how to withdraw and Lincoln pointed to it as part of our origin as a nation. We seceded from Britain. Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

Miriam Kerzner · 2 months ago

The DOI justifies withdrawal from a state. It explains why there was a need to break free of England and was certainly part of the origin of the US. It didn't establish the conditions or the nature of the US. The Articles of Confederation and then the Constitution did that. The

conditions noted in the DOI didn't exist at the time of the Civil War. No one claimed that the elections were faulty or that the courts weren't functioning or that the north was unfairly represented in the federal institutions. If anything, the opposite was true. Democracy requires a willingness to lose. The south lost the election.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

- Former [President of the United States Thomas Jefferson](#), in a letter to [William H. Crawford, Secretary of War](#) under President [James Madison](#), on June 20, 1816: "In your letter to Fisk, you have fairly stated the alternatives between which we are to choose : 1, licentious commerce and gambling speculations for a few, with eternal war for the many ; or, 2, restricted commerce, peace, and steady occupations for all. If any State in the Union will declare that it prefers separation with the first alternative, to a continuance in union without it, I have no hesitation in saying, 'let us separate'. I would rather the States should withdraw, which are for unlimited commerce and war, and confederate with those alone which are for peace and agriculture."

So the understanding of TJ way back when is superior to ours today and clearly he never considered once in, always in as something even possible. It wasn't even an issue to him. It is a mistake to judge things in the past by today's standards and we must be aware that winners write the history.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 months ago

The understanding of one man decades after ratification really doesn't add much. If it is "superior" because closer in time, it is necessarily "inferior" to 1787.

During the ratification debates, we see no one saying "hey, why are we so worried? If we don't like it we'll just leave." On both sides, people's arguments presupposed a union without the unilateral right to leave.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

>The understanding of one man decades after ratification really doesn't add much.

IOW according to you we should not assume once in always in - the course premise.

↑ -3 ↓ · flag




[Alec D. Rogers](#) · 2 months ago

That makes little (and I really mean "no" sense).

All of these "anonymous" posts trying to justify the confederacy are just laughably beneath response.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

 A post was deleted

Anonymous · 2 months ago 

Alec,

Wrong to say I support the confederacy, My point is that they had the right to secede.

Check out the picture of Walter Williams at the end of his recent article:

## Parting Company

By [Walter E. Williams](#)

December 31, 2013

Here's a question that I've asked in the past that needs to be revisited. Unless one wishes to obfuscate, it has a simple yes or no answer. If one group of people prefers strong government control and management of people's lives while another group prefers liberty and desires to be left alone, should they be required to enter into conflict with one another and risk bloodshed and loss of life in order to impose their preferences on the other group? Yes or no. My answer is no; they should be able to peaceably part company and go their separate ways.

The problem our nation faces is very much like a marriage in which one partner has an established pattern of ignoring and breaking the marital vows. Moreover, the offending partner has no intention to mend his ways. Of course, the marriage can remain intact while one party tries to impose his will on the other and engages in the deviousness of one-upsmanship and retaliation. Rather than domination or submission by one party, or domestic violence, a more peaceable alternative is separation.

I believe our nation is at a point where there are enough irreconcilable differences between those Americans who want to control other Americans and those Americans who want to be left alone that separation is the only peaceable alternative. Just as in a marriage where vows are broken, our rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution have been grossly violated by a government instituted to protect them. These constitutional violations have increased independent of whether there's been a Democrat-controlled Washington or a Republican-controlled Washington.

There is no evidence that Americans who are responsible for and support constitutional abrogation have any intention of mending their ways. You say, "Williams, what do you mean

by constitutional abrogation?" Let's look at the magnitude of the violations.

Article I, Section 8 of our Constitution lists the activities for which Congress is authorized to tax and spend. Nowhere on that list is there authority for Congress to tax and spend for: Medicare, Social Security, public education, farm subsidies, bank and business bailouts, food stamps and thousands of other activities that account for roughly two-thirds of the federal budget. Neither is there authority for congressional mandates to citizens about what type of health insurance they must purchase, how states and people may use their land, the speed at which they can drive, whether a library has wheelchair ramps, and the gallons of water used per toilet flush. The list of congressional violations of both the letter and spirit of the Constitution is virtually without end. Our derelict Supreme Court has given Congress sanction to do just about anything for which they can muster a majority vote.



James Madison, the acknowledged father of the Constitution, explained in Federalist Paper No. 45: "The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce. ... The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives and liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement and prosperity of the State." Our founder's constitutional vision of limited federal government has been consigned to the dustbin of history.

Americans have several options. We can like sheep submit to those who have contempt for liberty and our Constitution. We can resist, fight and risk bloodshed and death in an attempt to force America's tyrants to respect our liberties and Constitution. A superior alternative is to find a way to peaceably separate into states whose citizens respect liberty and the Constitution. My personal preference is a restoration of the constitutional values of limited government that made us a great nation.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Mark Nisson · 2 months ago

Oh, I get it. It's the old, "I know (or agree with) a black person, therefore I am not a racist" argument.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Mark,

Sorry, the issue is that Clarence Thomas is not allowed to have his own opinion and that comes from the left and is as racist as Jim Crow.

BTW, go SeaHawks and Richard Sherman is my favorite Seahawk.

why not address the ideas of Walter Williams who suggests secession, peaceful secession is a, food idea today. Clearly Democrats are going to remain in the modern of taking away individual freedom of their fellow Americans so maybe we doom defense together and let the rest of us get states where Democrats rule. The South had the right to leave the union back then and the case is even stronger today.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Mark Nisson · 2 months ago

Rather than addressing the comments of Walter Williams (who you happen to agree with) let's allow the course to unfold a bit more. It seems you're not here to learn, but instead to use the discussion forums for your personal crusade against what you perceive to be "liberalism."

In my own view, if not that of the course staff, you're abusing your privilege to be enrolled in the class (for free!) by using these forums as a platform for expressing your rather partisan views. As evidence of this, all one needs to do is read your many off-topic rants.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

I had no idea of the direction of the course when I signed up for it. Clearly you don't agree with the 1st Amendment which is why we need it. The guys who the SCOTUS think along the same ideas that I do and it could have been one a 5/4 court the course would have lead the course who supported the strict construction. The left seeks outcomes that justify their beliefs. Strict constructionists are interested in process and having it abide by rules.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



Anthony Watkins · 2 months ago

Delegates opposed to [slavery](#) proposed that only free inhabitants of each state be counted for apportionment purposes, while delegates supportive of slavery, on the other hand, opposed the proposal, wanting slaves to count in their actual numbers. A compromise which was finally agreed upon of counting "*all other persons*" as only three-fifths of their actual numbers reduced the representation of the slave states relative to the original proposals, but improved it over the Northern position.<sup>[1]</sup> An inducement for slave states to accept the Compromise was its tie to taxation in the same ratio, so that the burden of taxation on the slave states was also reduced.

this clearly shows the pro slavery folks wanted the slaves counted, not as voters, but as extra votes for the "property owners", the 3/5ths is a compromise as opposed allowing everyone to vote (that wasn't gonna happen) or not counting anyone who isn't allowed to vote. using it as a defense of slave holding states is not only disingenuous, it is morally dishonest

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

what is dishonest is to claim the North didn't get a benefit by the counting of slaves as less than one person. This means Northerners were only concerned about power and not equality for all people. Leftists bend over backwards trying to rewrite actual history. No one is arguing for slavery today. The issue was how Northern people did not want Blacks counted fully for the count of representation. IOW ... the left supported taxation for 3/5th representation. Most women weren't voters back then either. This remains an ugly stain on advocates of big government. Their hears today claim Republicans are all racists - same tool - tell a falsehood to gain control. "The Rich" are also demons according to the left today.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Miriam Kerzner · 2 months ago

If the slaves were not being represented (they didn't have the vote) and they weren't themselves being taxed or serving in militias, why should they have been counted at all? No other form of property was being counted for the purposes of representation.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Mark Nisson · 2 months ago

"Most women weren't voters back then either."

Yes, but you're comparing apples to oranges. The interests of women (and children) were putatively represented by the men in their families. The interests of blacks were not represented at all.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

A post was deleted

Miriam Kerzner · 2 months ago

Albert,

Who are you asking? If you are directing your question at me the issue is why the slaves should be counted at all. The North argued that they shouldn't be and the South that they should. The question then becomes what the logic is for counting them at all. If slaves are property only, then they shouldn't be counted because other kinds of property were not counted in order to determine representation in the House. The only other reasons to count them would be to tax them, (but they weren't taxed) or to ensure that they served their time in

the militia (but they didn't serve there either). The census was taken in order to determine representation. Unlike children or women, though, it can hardly be argued that the slaves interests were represented by their masters who would vote in their stead. In other words, there is no logical reason to count slaves at all. To do so was a concession by the free states in order to convince the slave states to ratify the Constitution. Without them, especially Virginia, the union would not have succeeded; but it set up a deep-seated conflict that would lead to the Civil War.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Miriam,

You are ignoring women - same issue. It doesn't matter what your feelings are today. The fact is the deal was made between the two parties and then the North broke the deal. Elsewhere the South's extensive list of other complaints are listed - all violations of the original agreement. When one side broke as many covenants of the contract as the North did and the North intended to keep taxing the South and spending their cash in the North that was too much. Look what happened to the South. The North destroyed them and their economy has still yet to be what it would be if the North had not taken such a heavy toll ... like Sherman's march to the sea. Slaves tried to tag along with Sherman's troops but Sherman would not permit it. Disaster for those Blacks.

So the idea of one side as all bad and the other wearing the white hate is wrong. It is really too bad that the South did not pay the royalties to Eli Whitney on his cotton gin. If innovation of interchangeable parts had been located in the South instead of the North (Eli got tired of trying to get the South to abide by the law and pay him what they owed and went back north) then what would have happened is slavery would have ended naturally as it did in every other civilized country in the world and the South today would be the economic powerhouse of the world and its high tech center.

So in effect by cheating Eli of his royalties the South had all that destruction coming. The North cheated them but they cheated Eli. What goes around comes around.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Albert,

>How does that compare to slaves.

Suppose that slaves were counted the same as women (what the North feared and would not agree to) .... then the South would have controlled the politics of the new Nation.

When the North got the upper edge, via Eli Whitney launching the industrial revolution attracting people to their states, the North chose to tax the heck out of the South via the Morrill



Act. The North acquired the ability to take money from the South and spend it in the North,

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

>The interests of blacks were not represented at all.

It was the North that chose to make sure blacks weren't counted as a full person. Over and over in history stories this idea was put on the South since slavery is such a horrible institution.

But this move made the formation possible and then when the North got the upper hand they decided to tax the South and spend the money in the North. Like people in Boston did it too - the Boston tea party was caused by a much lower tax (%) than the Morrill tax.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

A post was deleted

Anonymous · a month ago

Harvey Klehr is the top historian in America. Emory. He has shown the pathway how the KGB has influenced views of most historians in America so they live with a Marxist view of history. Most historians figured Alger Hiss was innocent. At the fall of the USSR they had Harvey get access to all the papers of the KGB. so Harvey's views are based on fact and most historians are under the influence of the KGB and before that Marx.

Obama's pastor, Rev Wright, is a follower of James Cone's Marxist Black Liberation theology. Obama's personal mentor in his teens was Communist CPUSA member Frank Marshall Davis.

Closest advisors like Valeria Jarrett and David Axelrod also have ties to communism. Jarrett's husband is a communist.

of course you don't know this history. who wants to know that the world communist movement celebrates May 1st every year in honor to the Haymarket Riot of 1886 in Chicago. Many communists like Big Bill Haywood have half his ashes buried at a cemetery near where communists used a bomb to kill Chicago cops and the other half are buried at the Kremlin.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Mark Anthony · 2 months ago

This is a very interesting question. I live in Crawfordsville, Indiana which is home to the General Lew Wallace Study. General Wallace was NOT a primary northern General during the Civil War - he is probably best known as author of BEN HUR, but he is credited with saving Washington, DC from invasion by armies from the South.

So far as I know the Civil War was a declared war on both sides. As a matter of Law, fortunately for interpreters of the Constitution the Country remained united even if by force. Clearly if the Confederate States of America had won the war we can only speculate as to what might have happened. If you live in America you have no doubt seen signs to the effect that "the South will rise again" and some places and persons regularly celebrate and fly the Confederate Flag. For years the Democrat Party was the political party of the South but this has changed largely because of the changing political priorities of the modern Democrat Party and because of some of the Laws the Democrats have promoted in recent years.

I met an old Georgia Farmer when I was younger who stood by the old Formula for enumerating slaves. He figured a farmer smart enough to have all those employees deserved a few more votes in the U.S. House of Representatives!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

I went to Wabash and for some reason never visited Wallace's house. The Civil War most likely would have ended if the South had stayed aggressive right after the first Battle of Bull Run ... they could have marched right into DC and taken over while the North's army was in total disarray. I live in Calif but visited Savannah GA a few years ago and I happened upon a Civil War memorial sales convention. Lots of Confederate Flags. No longing for a return to slavery and really no racism evident. What they really seemed to want is freedom from control by America's political left. Like the people on MSNBC.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Stanley H Kelley · 2 months ago

Anonymous, I was born and raised in Georgia and have lived here for most of my 73 years. If you think there is no racism here you have had your eyes shut and your ears closed. I hear it all the time. Not long before the 2012 election I heard about how we have a "monkey" for President and the "n" word so many times I lost count. And it is not just in Georgia. Wake up. Quit being delusional.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

The ugliest things I've heard based on race are directed at Clarence Thomas - because he does not toe the party line. If you want documentation of present day hatred of men by feminists who vote Democrat happy to supply you plenty of quotes.

Look at the Trayvon Martin case. Very sad he was killed but the racism is all on the side of the left. Like Zimmerman is a white Hispanic. Bigotry and judging people by group

membership primarily happens on the left. Al Gore's dad was an extreme racist.

Consider the OJ Simpson case. Racists consider that he is innocent of the two murders regardless of the DNA evidence.

↑ -2 ↓ · flag



Gayle Morrow · a month ago

Apology for the off-topic nature of this post, but I must thank Stanley. I left the south mainly for that reason. I don't know the color of your skin, but my white skin seemed to tell those people to whom you refer that it was perfectly fine to spit their ugly racism to me, because of course, being white I certainly must agree with them! Ug! But you are right, it is not just in Georgia, or the southern U.S. anymore.

Also, Anon, I'm calling your bluff, except there is a catch. Supply *valid* quotes in which the content can be backed up with research done by professionals; that, my friend, does not include Wikipedia unless it is well-sourced from the above mentioned research. Have a nice day! (o:

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Stanley H Kelley · a month ago

Thank you Gayle. I am white. I was born in Georgia in 1940 and thus saw racism when it was far rawer than it is today, although it can be quite raw today in some circles. But younger people are less inclined to be severely racist. A few years ago when he was in the sixth grade my grandson ask his Mother if he could have a friend whom he had met on the school bus over to spend the night. He did not think it worth mentioning that the friend is black. This is major progress.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · a month ago

The Democrat party lost the South under LBJ and passage of the civil rights acts...

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

A post was deleted

Anonymous · a month ago

The idea of labeling Zimmerman a "white. Hispanic" came from racists on the left ... where the vast % of racists are today in our culture. Leftist racists figured by his last name he was white so the meme became here is more while on black violence that never stopped after the Civil War. That message dominated the discussion and MSNBC broadcasted it. Message of

syndicalism racism to control blacks to think that they can only get ahead as members of a group.

The left separates people into groups for political control. Republicans are supposed to have a "war against women" when about half of the 55 million babies killed since roe were female. the left gives Bill Clinton a pass and he raped Juanita Brodrick and abused Lewinsky and they have given Woody Allen. pass and leftist Whoopi Goldberg gives Roman Polanski, child rapist, a pass.

Clarence Thomas is demonized by the left because he has a thought pattern that supports the US Constitution.

Most Blacks believed OJ was innocent and his jury was racist to let him off the hook. The left focuses on racism by whites, yes it exists, rather than condemn racism in general. Right now even leftist Jews, strong Democrats, would deny the country of Israel to exist and support terrorists organizations that have done countless acts of terrorism against Isreal.

The very lovely and attractive Scarlett Johansen is under attack now for her Super Bowl commercial because the company who makes the product is on the West Bank. this places the political view of these people pretty much in line with Hitler's views about Jews. And the company hires 500 Palestinians.

Our leftist president supported the Muslim Brotherhood during the Arab Spring and the origin of this group dates back to when they were allies with Hitler ... who was allied with Stalin until he wasn't.

O'Reilly asked our president about Benghazi last night and our president blamed Fox for the problem and also said there was zero wrong with the IRS choosing only Tea Party applicants for 501(4) status freely given out to leftist groups.

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

passage

How did Bill Clinton's mentor vote? Al Gore's dad

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



[Gayle Morrow](#) · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Hi, Stanley. "This is major progress." And isn't that a shame that this would be considered *major* progress after how many years?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Ray Strong](#) · [a month ago](#) 🔒

In another placd on this thread a person wrote: *It seems to me many people today develop an idea of history that never existed to fill a particular need in the market place.*

### **Moonlight and Magnolias**

I agree with you. In Mississippi where I grew up the version of history Anonymous is invoking is called the "Moonlight and Magnolia" body of history. Starting with Jeff Davis' autobiography, there developed a series of books and stories justifying the Civil War, painting the South as victims, their actions as valorous not traitorous (and note this arose after they were all pardoned). This was done more to rebuild their own self-esteem than for any other reason. But it exists and colors the South's view of the Civil War and its history.

It was also used to justify the apartheid system known in America as "Jim Crow".

Before the War Jeff Davis (MS) and Alexander Stephens (GA) the Presidents and VP of the confederacy, both cited Slavery in their inauguration speeches as a reason for succession, and Both GA and MS confederate state constitutions stated that Slavery was the reason the constitutions were founded. Then in the 1870s, suddenly both men discovered that it was States Rights and the suppression by Northern Majorities that caused the War. Not Slavery.

From the Safety of Seattle, with no lived experience dealing with the problems directly, someone here has invented their own version of Antebellum history. And in doing so has made this thread useless to the average student. Since no one from Yale is correcting his falacies, I hope no foriegn student enrolled in this class thinks this Anonymous version of History is true.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag



Gayle Morrow · a month ago 🔒

Well said, Albert. Thank you.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott

Signature Track

· a month ago 🔒

I grew up in Tennessee in the 1950s and 60s..We southerners have a couple of habits that work against our own interests. We are unusually hot tempered I suspect from the Scot-Irish heritage. Also we are stubborn as donkeys. The people of the South decided to go to war because a candidate won with a minority vote because the election was split four ways. The major issue was continuation of slavery. We having that right Constitutionally protected with the judges siding with continuation of slavery we attacked Fort Sumter. A group of hotheads decided to take on the Northern half of the country which resulted in the loss of a way of life, 660,000 Americans killed, and the south decimated being an economic backwater for 100 years. Nobody ever accused us of being smart. The Jim Crow South gave the poor white sharecroppers the satisfaction knowing at least one other group was in worse shape that

being the negro. We are not monsters just not perfect. Our bad habits have traveled across these United States and we have those that would support an equally stupid idea of a second secession. I for one don't need to make a second experiment to see if the results would be different.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Consider big government also has done very bad things. Like Hamilton imposing a tax on whiskey to just target one group (mostly Scots Irish) to pay off debts to the rich. Consider that the North imposed a tax on the South. Lincoln told the South that they could keep their slaves, just pay the taxes for the benefit of the North that we just imposed on you. The tax on tea prompting the Boston Tea Party was much less.

You have your history wrong on Ft Sumter. The war started here to stop the collection of taxes, not to protect the institution of slavery. IOW, Lincoln wanted to perpetuate the institution of slavery and the government wanted its share of the revenue slavery produced.

Mafia calls this a shake down. Bill Gates was busy selling software but had not paid enough shakedown money to the government. Somtheynusednour tax money to shake him down for campaign contribution.

I pn N Ireland where your kin hail from it works differently. They use low taxes to attract a new business and then after the plant is about finished then the IRA AND the Protestant terrorist contingent will pay a visit to the owner and tell them that if they don't want trouble to pay so much money. in smaller communities the catholic IRA will ask a Protestant into their group or vice verse to make the appearance they have enough numbers to be taken seriously.

Lincoln was simply doing what the mafia does every, pay us money or we will break your windows. The South did not pay shakedown money so Lincoln made them pay. don't forget Lincoln told the South he had no legal right to interfere with slavery and that he was only after money.

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

As to filling a market need ... which point of view is it that doesn't discuss exactly why Ft Sumter was the place the war started? what was the place used for?

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

[Michael Scott](#) Signature Track · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Anonymous,  
Your reading of history is certainly unique. The seven deep South states seceded before Lincoln took office while James Buchanan was still in office he even attempted to resupply the

Fort Sumter before he left office. Fort Sumter was April 14-16, 1861. The tax on export of southern cotton Morrill tariff began in summer of 1861 with the blockade thus was after the battle Fort Sumter. It was approved by Congress as a punishment for the 7 states in rebellion. The tax was made moot by the Brits. The cotton exports to Britain fell 95% as they chose to source their cotton needs from India thus not finance the south's rebellion. The south had to change from cotton to food production during the war in any event. This made them unable to bounce back after the Civil War as their wasn't a market for their cotton. To be sure states rights was a major factor in the reasons for the Civil War. Which highlighted the hot headed nature of the south's shot callers. A tax on negros didn't have anything to do with the rebels firing for 22 hours on Fort Sumter. It was the actions by South Carolina at Fort Sumter that brought four more states into the war and Lincoln had requested 75,000 troops to put down the rebellion.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

gayle,

quotes from feminists showing that feminism is a hate group;

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

"I feel that 'man-hating' is an honourable and viable political act, that the oppressed have a right to class-hatred against the class that is oppressing them." — Robin Morgan, Ms. Magazine Editor "To call a man an animal is to flatter him; he's a machine, a walking dildo." — Valerie Solanas . "I want to see a man beaten to a bloody pulp with a high-heel shoved in his mouth, like an apple in the mouth of a pig." — Andrea Dworkin "Rape is nothing more or less than a conscious process of intimidation by which all men keep all women in a state of fear" — Susan Brownmiller "The more famous and powerful I get the more power I have to hurt men." — Sharon Stone "In a patriarchal society, all heterosexual intercourse is rape because women, as a group, are not strong enough to give meaningful consent." — Catherine MacKinnon "The proportion of men must be reduced to and maintained at approximately 10% of the human race." — Sally Miller Gearhart "Men who are unjustly accused of rape can sometimes gain from the experience." — Catherine Comins "All men are rapists and that's all they are" — Marilyn French "Probably the only place where a man can feel really secure is in a maximum security prison, except for the imminent threat of release." — Germaine Greer.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Mark Anthony · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Thank you Wabash College and everyone. The Little Giants had a reasonable football season this year. The Monon was ringing here in town after the season.

I do not think I am delusional. I know people treat one another like dirt at times even with all of the documents and rights and protections to the contrary. The Anti-Federalists were complaining that 1 Representative for 30,000 Americans was insufficient. At that "insufficient" ratio we would have 10,000 members in the House of Representatives today (I am, of course, rounding here for those math enthusiasts). For one comment as to whether the Civil War was over Slavery. Yes, yes, yes. Slavery and Economics. Money.

But I disagree with the thesis that getting only 3/5 of a person population increase for a slave FAVORS slavery or slave states. (Again, it's that math again). We don't give millionaires today 1 vote and employees earning less than \$100,000 a year only 3/5 a vote. Masters could have taken those slaves to the polls and got them to vote if they wanted. Favoring the South and Slavery would have meant giving each Slave a vote and adding 1 person for each 1 slave in the census, not 3/5 a person as is enumerated in our Constitution. Anybody who knows anything about the ritual of Cemetery voters registering and voting in some parts of the country knows this could be an amazing but true story.

If you own the corporation or the slaves don't you have to believe you are better than the other guy - even if you try to treat people as fairly as possible.

Even though I'm coming up with some disagreements, the course seems to be improving. Believe me, I only hope I'm up to standard on this.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

>Thank you Wabash College and everyone.

I never send them even a penny because they are a leftist propaganda factory - were hard core left back when I went there as well. But they did get me to expand my horizons and learn to connect ideas - leaned how to break stovepipe thinking that dominates America at all levels, left and right and limits our creativity.

We had lost the Monon Bell for many many years in a row when I went there. So a student sent a letter to the president of DePauw and said he was from Mexico and could he be shown around the college. DePauw's president (where Dan Quayle went to school) agreed and during the guided tour the student asked to see the Monon Bell, he had heard of the long competition even down in Mexico.

The guide was uncertain, he said the last time the bell was shown to anyone that students from Wabash stole it. So after seeing the bell later that night set of Wabash students stole the bell. And then Wabash won the football game the next day and rightfully kept the Monon Bell.

As to the 3/5th rule ... if people who paid taxes were the ones who voted (we see the consequence today when voters can vote to take what they don't earn) and these voters voted



for all the people then the South would have outvoted the North and no Civil War. The South could have mandated slavery in northern states be legal.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔗

Michael:

Lincoln was quite aware of the Morrill Tariff and supported it big time - his reason to become president ... it passed two days before he took office. To get an idea on the actual history can cut through the myth read Lincoln's own words. Two points from his 1st inaugural address - keep your slaves and pay your taxes. The Morrill Tariff was not the first tax of one group to benefit another - it started with the Whiskey Rebellion under Washington. 1828 Tariff of Abominations was an average 48% tariff on the South largely for the benefit of the North. President Jackson backed down and lowered the rate. and the tariff was collected in Charleston Harbor, the site of FT Sumter.

Lincoln passed 10 tariffs while he was president.

And the Whiskey rebels never paid the tax ... they have a TV show about that which runs on cable.

Lincoln's campaign slogan was "Protection for Home Industry." Lincoln was in the pocket of the railroads and in a speech in Pittsburg said that "no other issue was as important as raising the tariff rate."

<http://www.lewrockwell.com/2011/01/thomas-dilorenzo/more-lies-about-the-civil-war/>

"When he announced a naval blockade of the Southern ports during the first months of the war, he gave only one reason for the blockade: tariff collection."

"... in his first inaugural address Lincoln announced that it was his duty "to collect the duties and imposts," and then threatened "force," "invasion" and "bloodshed" (his exact words) in any state that refused to collect the federal tariff, the average rate of which had just been doubled two days earlier. He was not going to "back down" to tax protesters in South Carolina or anywhere else, as Andrew Jackson had done"

"the notorious Morrill Tariff, which more than doubled the average tariff rate (from 15% to 32.6% initially), was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives during the 1859–60 session of Congress, and was the cornerstone of the Republican Party's economic policy. It then passed the U.S. Senate, and was signed into law by President James Buchanan on March 2, 1861, two days before Lincoln's inauguration, where he threatened war on any state that failed to collect the new tax. At the time, the tariff accounted for at least 90 percent of all federal tax revenues. The Morrill Tariff therefore represented a more than doubling of the rate of federal taxation!"

According to diLorenzo:

"This threat to use "force" and "invasion" against sovereign states, by the way, was a threat to commit treason. Article 3, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution defines treason as follows:

"Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against **them**, or in adhering to **their** Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort" (emphasis added). Lincoln followed through with his threat; his invasion of the Southern states was the very definition of treason under the Constitution.

Jefferson Davis, like Lincoln, highlighted the tariff issue in his February 18, 1861 inaugural address, delivered in Montgomery, Alabama (From [The Papers of Jefferson Davis](#), vol. 7, pp. 45–51). After announcing that the Confederate government was "anxious to cultivate peace and commerce with all nations" Davis said the following:

An agricultural people, whose chief interest is the export of a commodity required in every manufacturing country, our true policy is peace, and the freest trade, which our necessities will permit. It is alike our interest, and that of all those to whom we would sell and from whom we would buy, that there should be the fewest practicable restrictions upon the interchange of commodities. There can be but little rivalry between ours and any manufacturing or navigating community, such as the Northeastern States of the American Union. It must follow, therefore, that a mutual interest would invite good will and kind offices. If, however, passion or the lust of dominion should cloud the judgment or inflame the ambition of those States, we must prepare to meet the emergency . . .

When Davis spoke of a "passion or the lust for dominion," he was referring to the constant attempts, for some seventy years, of the Northern Whig and Republican parties to plunder the South with the instrument of protectionist tariffs, as was attempted with the 1828 Tariff of Abominations. In other words, he declared here that, in his opinion, Lincoln was deadly serious (pun intended) about enforcing the newly-doubled rate of federal tariff taxation with a military invasion of the Southern states, and was preparing for war as a result.

Before the war, Northern newspapers associated with the Republican Party were editorializing in favor of naval bombardments of the Southern ports because they knew that the South was adopting free trade, while the North was moving in the direction of a 50% average tariff rate (which did in fact exist, more or less, from 1863 to 1913, when the federal income tax was adopted). These Republican party propagandists correctly understood that much of the trade of the world would enter the U.S. through Southern ports under such a scenario. Rather than adopting reasonable tariff rates themselves, they agitated for war on the South.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Michael Scott Signature Track · a month ago

You must have time on your hands. The seven states in question had left the union prior to Lincoln taking office on March 4, 1861. All of the talk of tariffs are moot when India became

the supplier of cotton to Great Britain...Pretty much every action taken by the South resulted in the ruination of a vast geographical fortune. It also made generations of southerners poor.

My ancestors went from landowning and a few slave holding farmers in Kentucky to generations of poverty. My Great Grandfather migrated to Illinois to find steady employment as a foundry worker. My father after the WW2 finally broke us back into middle class status.

Anybody that finds the Civil War a romantic time in history is an idiot. All New World slavery was gone by the later 19th century.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

you miss the point Michael. No one is arguing for slavery.

Here is what an employees of the treasury dept (Ruth.Madrigal@treasury.gov) has written in an email:

"Don't know who in your organizations is keeping tabs on c4s, but since we mentioned potentially addressing them (off - plan) in 2013, I've got my radar up and this seemed interesting...

"off plan" means secret from everyone. Ruth sent this to the head of the IRS which means the Treasury is directing the IRS to persecute and suppress political opponents of the president. Everyone pays taxes and then that money is used for one part. This is a direct consequence of the Civil War.

The reason why the government can spy on you on all your communications and has unlimited power (meaning the individual has none) results from the Civil War and the destruction of the 10th Amendment - which enables a state to leave the union.

10th Amendment:

*The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.*

This means the 10th Amendment empowers states to leave the United States.

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Karl Frank Signature Track · [2 months ago](#) 🔒

Some of the posts in this thread consider the federal Consitution to be a contract entered into by the states, and conclude that there is therefore a right for states to secede. Is it supposed then, that there a right, under contract law, to fail to perform to a valid contract, just because you've changed your mind?

Attempts to justify secession under the contract analogy, have tried to justify the secession of a state by arguing that OTHER STATES had broken the terms of the contract, (e.g. South Carolina's complaint

against New Jersey), but the Constitution is not formulated as a contract between one state and another. The contract interpretation has no basis in the text.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Karl,

People back then have a better take than today:

**5. During the war, New Englanders considered seceding from the United States.**

The concepts of states' rights, nullification and secession so associated with the South were actually first voiced by the North during the War of 1812. New England fiercely opposed "Mr. Madison's War" from the very start, and the region suffocated under British naval blockades. By 1814, the starving citizens of Nantucket pledged neutrality, the Massachusetts governor sent a secret emissary to negotiate a separate peace with the British and some New Englanders even advocated secession. In the final weeks of 1814, 26 delegates from across New England meeting behind closed doors at the Hartford Convention ultimately decided not to call for secession, but they heartily endorsed states' rights and nullification.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



ABDIRAHMAN ISMAIL ELMI · a month ago

Really nice input.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

↓ scroll down for more ↓

