Welcome to lecture number 10. As I mentioned to you in the past, there would come a time when we have some lectures that have nothing to do with Native American peoples. This is one of them. Now, keep in mind, we're going to touch on some big topics and we're going to treat them rather quickly because we're going to discuss Africans slavery, the Civil War, part of Reconstruction. These are, of course, humongous topics in US history. And if this wasn't a survey course, with the thematic approach specific to Native American history, we would be dedicating a lot more time to them. But it is not. So keep in mind what you're going to get is sort of the very down to basics version of this section of US history. But I figure at least a bare minimum need to be mentioned in order for these to still be considered a US history course. So today you catch a break from all the Native American material and we jump into something else entirely. So let's start off with the theme of African slavery in US history. Now, there are some people, for example, there was a presidential candidate in the 1990s, Bob Dole, who actually argued that we shouldn't really be discussing slavery in school because it makes you feel less patriotic, which I mean, in and all the weird kind of way, I guess, that makes sense if the goal, but the goal of history is not to make you patriotic. The goal of history is to learn what really happened without too much of an agenda. And of course, the story of slavery in the US is a big one. The way, let's start in a more general sense. You know, slavery is something that has existed in many, many, many human societies throughout history. And each society has found ways to justify it. Exploiting somebody else's labor has always been a big deal in many human societies. And in addition to exploiting labor, another really disturbing, but true, function of slavery, there was a lot of sexual slavery. You know, people being enslaved in order to provide free sex to slave owners. So in any way, the Europeans in North America tried many different approaches to slavery. In slavery, African people who is not the only approach. They would try enslaving natives. The Spaniards definitely did it. Some of the British did to some degree, not as common. One of the problems with enslaving natives though is that they would run away. They knew the land better than you did. And they could disappear and and you never catch them again because this is their land and they know it better than you do. So that was a problem. Indenture servants, essentially other Europeans, not exactly slaves, but kind of. The problem with indenture servants was that on one level, they they look like everyone else in your society. So if they could escape and go to some other town, they could blend in more easily. And also some people didn't like twin slave people of the same skin color and were also Christian. Made them a little uncomfortable. So Africans labor solved for Europeans both of those problems because unlike native people, Africans would not know the land well and would not have villages and community to join once they escaped. Also unlike native people, they did not, they shared many of the same diseases with Europeans. So they were not quite as susceptible to them, which means they lasted longer. In other words, a better investment in terms of slavery. And unlike indenture servants, they were at least early on, they were not Christian. And because of their skin color, they stood out as different. So they couldn't blend in in some other town like indenture servants. So all of these made the choice of enslaving Africans an attractive one for Europeans. The places where they will draw from will be the west coast of Africa. So the straighter path to the Americas. You start seeing a little bit of the Portuguese trading for slaves on the coast of Africa in the 1400s, but the Africans slave trade will boom, following the discovery of the Americas. And the prime destination, this some by the way, will get to crazy numbers. You know, it's estimated that several millions of people, one estimate I read suggests that about 11 million Africans were transported to the Americas. The bulk of them will go actually not to what will be the United States, they will not go to North America. The bulk of them will go to the Caribbean and to South America. That's where the vast majority ended up. But some solid numbers also ended up going to North America. The punch of different Europeans got into this trade. The Portuguese, the Dutch, English, French, Swedes, German, some from British colonists in New England and so on. And the way it was set up is that they would go visit the west coast of Africa, usually make a deal with some coastal tribes so that they couldn't slave their tribal enemies and then bring them to the coast and sell them to Europeans slave traders. If you wanted to join the slave trade in this fashion, great. You would receive access to cons and to other European tools in exchange for slaves. If you didn't want to join, well, that was kind of a problem. And there's a bit of an arm ratio, because let's say you're an African tribe on the coast of West Africa. And the our approach by Europeans suffering you to be part of the slave trade that you can go in slave people you don't like and will pay you. Let's say you don't like it. You don't want to be part of this slave trade. Well, guess what's going to happen? All your neighbors, all bunch of other tribes are going to get guns by participating in the trade. And you are going to be without guns. Take a while guess who's getting in slave next. So in some way, tribes had to join the slave trade whether they wanted to or not, because if you didn't, you would have less weapons and you would be more likely to be enslaved yourself. So there was a bit of an arms race there where whether willingly or unwillingly you had to be part of the slave trade. The whole trade itself was, I mean, I'm sure you guys have heard a million times a war for it was, but it really, really was awful. The trip could take anywhere between three weeks to three months from Africa to the Americas, depending on the season and the winds and everything. Very common for about 10 to 20% of anybody loaded up onto the ships to die before they reached the Americas, because conditions were filthy. They were overcrowded. The sanitation was non-existent. So many, many people would get sick and die during the journey. But for the slave traders, it was more convenient to just keep business as usual than it was to try to provide more room and better sanitation because just a 10 or 20% loss was remade by just packing the ships full of people. And so what if 10 or 20% die, you can still make a bunch of money, whereas if you have to give more room and more sanitation, you may have less people dying, but you also have less people on the ship and so you make less money. So that's kind of the logic why it was done this way. The profits involved in the slave trade were so high that many Europeans built a fortune on the slave trade. And some of these guys became so rich that they would later be the people who will finance the industrial revolution since they were the ones who had the money to invest. So there's an odd connection between slavery and the industrial revolution. As far as early forms of resistance, you know, many times people try to rebel as long as the ships were still within the site of the coast of Africa. But by the time they were in the middle of the ocean, people kind of gave up. So the main form of resistance would be suicide at that point. Once they arrived in the Americas, they were kind of washed up, put up at the slave market where people would at an auction, where people would bid on them. And that's the process of how it was done. Now, one of the issues that one of the things that happened initially is that the early African slaves come into America's, they often end up sharing the same quarters with indenture servants. They share the same lives with indenture servants. So not surprisingly, they began to build alliances across racial lines. To the point where slave owners realized, whoa, whoa, maybe we're making a mistake here, because now we have a lot of people, both white and black who don't like us very much, and they are joining together, we need to figure out a way to keep them divided. So one way to do that was to use divide and conquer to begin teaching indenture servants in a way as weird as it may sound, teach them racism, you know, instill the idea that no matter how humble their status was, by being white, they were superior to black people, they would be treated differently from black people, you kind of throw them more abode, whereas enslaved Africans would be treated much worse to kind of try to create jealousy between the two, try to create conflict between the two. So rather than joining together against you, they are too busy hating on each other. And that's so much easier than for not to have to deal with major rebellions. Even laws were passed against interracial sex, precisely for the sake of avoiding these unions, in this case physical, but on every level between black and whites between, you know, no interracial marriages among them and so on and so forth. So some of the first laws against interracial sex and interracial marriages were passed in the 1600s. And some of them as weird as them may sound, they were not struck down in United States by the Supreme Court until 1967, which is insane when you think about our recent that is, but they were still losing the book against interracial sex and interracial marriages in 1960s in US, which is a crazy statistic, but in any case. In terms of divide and conquer, in addition to keeping indentured servants and and Africans live separate and try to pit them against one another, there was also an effort to try to keep enslaved Africans separate and against one another, not only by buying people from different tribes where they wouldn't speak the same language, so it would be a little harder to organize, but also to split them between houses, slaves and field slaves. Now the difference between house slaves and field slaves goes something like this. The idea was that field slaves were those who as the name imply, work in the fields, which was brutal hard physical labor, usually subjected to fairly heavy punishments if they slacked in their work. The only advantage to being a field slave was that you would get to spend once the day of work was over, you are in the barracks with other enslaved Africans sharing the same quarters. So at least there's some companionship there. House slaves at the advantage of having usually easier work, not quite as back-breaking as picking cotton in the fields or things like that, you would work inside the main house, being a cook, a nanny, a maid, something along those lines, which was easier work, but the downside was that you are constantly surrounded by just the people who enslaved you, you sort of lack the companionship of other people dealing with the same circumstances. And this division of course works through the advantage of the slave owners, because the goal was to keep the interest of fields slaves and house slaves separate, so that again it would be harder for them to join together. So this idea of divide and conquer was kind of a big deal when it came to slavery. One technological invention that had a big impact on slavery was in 1793, the invention of a machine known as the cotton gene. The cotton gene was a machine removing the seeds from cotton without destroying the fiber in an automatic fashion. Now this made the process of getting cotton much cheaper. As a result of this there was increased demand for cotton, because since the price for overall the product was cheaper than many more people wanted to buy it for clothes. So this led to increased demand, which of course led to increased demands for slaves to work the cotton fields. So that was another aspect. Now life as a slave as you may imagine was not exactly fun. There were many many many challenges to it. There was of course violence, you know the whole system of slavery cannot exist without violence. There were brutal physical punishments for any infraction, but they were not that rare. Creating families was extremely difficult, because at any moment any member of the family could be sold to building long lasting bonds in this environment where you don't control anything is pretty difficult. Also highly unpleasant but common side of slavery was rape. So african, initially african and later african-american women being completely vulnerable to rape by the slave owners, also posed some challenges in terms of family life. Or for example, the man in their life being completely powerless to stop left from happening. These were all things that really mess with their heads in addition to the disease for the male and women being the targets of rape on a regular basis. Horrendous to say the least. So there was, and by the way when I say rape in some cases it may be violent, in some cases it is not, it was just pressure that you know if you say yes your life would be made a lot easier by the slave owner. So while it may not feed the picture of violent rape it was raping nonetheless since you weren't really in a position to say no anyway. So these were of course really distorably ugly stories regarding slavery and unfortunately they were very common. In terms of religion early on there was no, there was no effort to convert african-americans. If anything it was actually some Europeans enjoyed the fact of being able not to convert them because that meant it made it easier on them to enslave people who are non-Christians than people who are Christians. But eventually these changed and in time there was more effort to convert them to Christianity and in some way this was used to justify slavery. It was like hey you are giving up your freedom and your labor but in exchange you are bringing you the light of God to you so really you are doing your favor. Now not surprisingly the kind of messages found in the bible that slave owners emphasized were all those messages that led to people accepting their lot in life you know your reward will be in heaven just respect directly authorities, respect your masters that kind of stuff. Of course many slave African's focused on very different messages, all the tales of jewish people escaping slavery in Egypt, all the messages that there's no difference in the eyes of God between a slave owner and a slave, all these things that you know each one won't shape Christianity what they want that it to be to a large degree. In terms of resistance it's actually rather puzzling sometime to notice that large-scale rebellions were extremely rare in North America, hardly ever happened. There were only a couple you know there's the net turner rebellion very famous from 1831 other than that not very often. Why? Well for fairly obvious reasons that your chances to succeed with a large-scale rebellion were next to nothing and if you are caught and defeated you could look forward to torture and death and nothing else so needless to say not many people wanted to set up a big rebellion when the odds of success were so small. Unlike this by the way is different from what happened in places like Brazil or the Caribbean's where people would rebal in some cases in major ways and then set up fugitive communities in the wild. This didn't happen much in North America. The main forms of rebellion that you see were things like escaping that was you know probably one of the more common ones, tried to run away particularly young men. Breaking tools, trying to get away, faking stupidity to do as little work as humanly possible. The racist stereotypes of the times was that slaves were stupid and inferior anyway so you would play to that stereotype to get away without being punished by just playing the stupid role of oh you men, I was supposed to clear 40 acres, I only clear four, I'm so sorry, my mistake. Trying to cater to white expectations regarding um regarding African intelligence where really you're just playing them so that you could try to do a little less work out of these people who are trying to squeeze every ounce of labor out of you. Those were some of the most common kinds of resistance. Large-scale rebellion definitely not common at all so that's something to keep in mind. Now, souther in economy was extremely tied to slavery. Slavery was big when it came to the cultivation of tobacco, rice and particularly cotton. As I mentioned in a previous lecture in 1793 the invention of the cotton gene made it easier to separate the seeds of the cotton from the fiber making cotton a much more profitable crop so these led to a rise in slavery. Cotton was exported to England to France all over the place. Now cotton is a tough crop, it tends to exuse the soil really fast so there was this constant need for more land which played an important factor in Indian removal in the south. So while here was the problem though, that while the south was becoming more dependent on cotton and slavery for its economic well-being, public opinion all over the globe was beginning to change in regard to slavery whereas slavery had been fairly popular for many many centuries. By now more and more people found themselves in moral opposition to slavery. So England for example had outlawed the slave trade in 1807 and in 1808 the United States passed the law that it would be legal to import more slaves meaning you could no longer go out to Africa, kidnap people and bring them over here. That was illegal. Slavery was still legal but it was homegrown slavery you know people were enslaved at the moment, their kids, their kids, kids and so on and so forth but you could no longer bring people from Africa and import them. The reality of life in the south at this time was really rough you know and I say the south because slavery by now had pretty much disappeared from all northern states. Even before that most slave owners in the north it was mainly household servants because the northern economy was not that kind of big plantation type of stuff. So slavery was primarily southern phenomenon by now. There was very high infant mortality because women were usually overworked and underfed so couldn't provide the necessary nutrients for their kids. Life expectancy in the south was really low for everybody. For enslaved Africans was often just in the 30s which tells you how horrendously bad conditions were. You know when you think that today life expectancy in the US is in the 70s to think that the average for black people in the south was in the 30s that's pretty bad right there. One interesting argument that southerners made to defend slavery. They argued that slavery was more humane than wage labor in the north because they would take care of slaves from birth to death even when they were no longer productive whereas in the north they would pay you money but when you were no longer a productive worker they would just throw you to the curb and you would be struggling trying to find enough money to survive on. So they argued that such a better more humane system with the care of them for all their lives. Slaves have no responsibilities they just have to do their job and they don't have to worry about too much stuff is actually humane thing. Now of course not really but that was what was explained. As I mentioned in terms of religion I kind of hinted at this before but were to repeat in and expanded on. There were definitely some traditional African religions were still practice but eventually particularly following the great awakening in the 1700s the practice of Christianity started spreading among enslaved Africans and as I mentioned before the slave owners who didn't fassize messages in the bible of obedience that your award will be in the next life whereas enslaved African African Americans would focus on the notion of you know everybody's equal in the eyes of God and things like that. Of course some of the goes without saying that violence was a big part of the slavery system was what kept it going and kept it alive otherwise clearly nobody remains as slave if there's no threat of violence and as hinted at before there was a division between fields slave and house slaves. House slaves was usually an easier life but more lonely because you are surrounded just by the slave owners whereas fields slaves were harder work but at least you had the companionship of other people in the same condition. The one of the things that we see in these arguments there is something that's really both sides both the proselyvery and anti-slavery sides would turn to the bible to justify their stance and it's kind of weird because it's like how can you how can two people are in opposite things both turn to the same source for confirmation I mean is the bible proselyvery or anti-slavery because how can it be both at the same time well what happened was the same thing that usually happens with most issues when it comes to religion is that people will read the book and we'll find what they want to find in it there is no passage in the bible that Adam Biggosley comes out and says slavery is absolutely good or absolutely bad so if you supported slavery you would highlight all the passages that clearly seem to support slavery and you skip the passages that don't if you were anti-slavery you'd highlight all the passages that seem to go against the theory of slavery and conveniently forget about all the passages that support it. Fact is in the bible there are both there are clearly passages that seem to support slavery and there are clearly some passages that seem to go against it so much like with every single else where people make up their own interpretation of religion to suit their needs same thing happened when it came to slavery everybody made the bible say whatever it is that they wanted and guess what there were quotes that would support pretty much any position so you could literally make it say anything and both sides did regularly in these arguments prevent the against slavery they would very much use the bible as a weapon among the people the the movement that existed at this time of course the movement for abolition of slavery was a particularly powerful one it involved of course three black people it involved Quakers who are against slavery it involves white white reformers who hated slavery they all had very different reasons for being against slavery but they were all united in the goal of abolishing slavery now many Quakers wanted the sponsor the return of formerly former slaves of emancipated slaves to a place that they would call Liberia on the coast of Africa in the early 1800s many northerners they were more than happy to get rid of black people from their midst because just because they were against slavery doesn't mean that they were not racist but it was very difficult to organize this movement to bring people to Africa so very few I mean it did happen but not that much most African Americans want the dandas slavery and gaining civil rights there were a few notable examples of white activists against slavery were embraced more radical to act formed than the typical abolitionist one for example William Lloyd Garrison he wasn't just against slavery this is something that all abolitionists shared that he wanted full equality for African Americans which is something that many anti-slavery folks were not so keen on Garrison also was unique because it is emphasis on pacifism his support for women's rights which was definitely not a popular concept in the mid 1800s this made him a hero to some and made him absolutely hated by others the state of Georgia offered money to anyone who would kidnap Garrison in order to bring him to trial within the state of Georgia for inciting to rebellion because he speeches against slavery were fiery enough that the state of Georgia didn't really like it southern states reacted to this campaign for emancipation by passing even more repressive laws against black people so in the short run it actually the campaign for emancipation made life even harder for black people in the south so it was you know as clearly needed but at the same time he would uh you would be a bit troublesome to achieve the goal because commitment to slavery was such a central tenant of life in the south at this time there are quite a few people who are against abolition not all these slave owners of course but for example many Irish people were not too keen on the abolition of slavery because that would mean more black people who would compete with them for minimum wage jobs so there was a lot of violence against abolitionists even in the north not just in the south and the rejection back in 1836 had passed the gag rule to prohibit any discussion of anti-slavery petitions because you consider those inflammatory and potentially divisive John Quincy Adams on the other end had been mad because the rule went against freedom of speech so it was eventually repealed by 1844 so moral of the story there was a lot of controversy in American society at this time as it's inevitable that it would be in a society that's changing extremely fast in terms of discussing the history of slavery in the United States and the movement for the abolition of slavery an important moment take place in 1850 with a piece of legislation known as the Fugitive Slave Law. The Fugitive Slave Law basically imposed penalties on anyone not cooperating with returning slaves who had escaped in turning them over to slave catchers, professional slave catchers who would come to the north to capture them and bring them back into the south so the Fugitive Slave Law makes it a crime to help these people on the run or even just not to cooperate in helping catching them. Now, neither is to say did not go well with many abolitionists you know some radical abolitionists operated while we're known as the Underground Railroad which was basically this highly legal network to try to help people escape from slavery in the south and take them to an northern state get them a job and help them blend in and disappear so that they wouldn't be caught again. This was obviously super illegal according to the Fugitive Slave Law and yet quite a few people participated in it anyway. There was also a lot of cases of violence with fighting between slave catchers and people wanting to defend individuals who had escaped slavery and were in the north and again I won't give you all the examples but there were plenty of those so lots of violence begin to pop up over this issue. Something else that I've been around this time in 1854 an act called the Kansas-Nebraskack was passed which basically proposed to take lands away from American Indian tribes north of Oklahoma. These were tribes that have been kicked out, pushed there with the promise that they will get to keep the land there forever. Well, forever came to an end in 1854 because those lands will now be opened to settlement by white citizens. So that's again not many complaints because it's not exactly like too many you know Native Americans had too many advocates in Congress but that's something that happens at this time. Something much more controversial because there were people on both sides of the issue was what began to happen in places like Kansas and Missouri. Missouri had traditionally been pro-slavery and some pro-slavery settlers from Missouri came to Kansas trying to rig the elections there with Missouri votes in order to try to push Kansas in a pro-slavery direction. However, they were not the only people coming to Kansas. There were also some abolitionists from New England resettling there as well. Both sides were armed, both sides were ready to fight. And so in this context is where you start seeing some serious violence taking place between the two sides. There were in 1856 there was pro-slavery guys just burned down a lot of Lawrence Kansas attacking abolitionists left and right. In return, John Brown would become a very famous figure in American history and his sons plus a few other friends went after pro-slavery guys and killed several of them. So now we have a scenario where there are heats being placed back and forth. If they had they had cars back then they would have been doing drive-by shootings. They didn't have cars but you got the idea. Lots of murders happening back and forth between abolitionists and pro-slavery guys. Even in the Senate, I mean, not murder but there was major violence even in the Senate. Once there was a senator from Massachusetts, Charles Sumner, gave a very fiery speech against slavery and personally attacking some other senators. So this other senator from South Carolina, Preston Brooks, who was horrified both because the speech by Sumner criticized the South in general, criticized slavery and even criticized Brooks' uncle. So Brooks showed up and just walked up to charge Sumner in the Senate while he was sitting down at his desk and proceeded to beat the living hell out of him with a cane until the guy started bleeding everywhere. He eventually lost consciousness. Brooks kept beating him until eventually the cane broke. And to give you an idea of how people reacted to this, you know, people in the North were horrified. They considered this an example of pure savagery. Many people in the South started sending canes to Brooks' house saying, great job but use this cane next time. It's third year. You won't break and you'll be able to finish the job. So that gives you a bit of an idea of how heavily divided the country was over this kind of issue. So that's where, you know, the tension is reaching a boiling point over this issue of slavery. Even the Supreme Court got into it. For example, in 1857 in a famous landmark decision that dreads caught the decision. What happened was enslaved African-American sued because the slave owner took him to a state where slavery was illegal. So he figured, okay, then, well, if I'm in a known slave state, then I am no longer a slave. So he sued the for his freedom. He said the residence in a free land had made him free. However, by the time the case reached the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court essentially said that this guy had no right to sue in a federal court because only citizens have that right and slaves are not citizens. If we want to get technical, what slaves are are property and property doesn't sue anybody. So this was a decision that very much upset a bullish onist because it was clearly on the pro-slavery side. Now, back in Kansas, both the pro-slavery and anti-slavery guys started creating their own governments, which one claiming that they were the real one and the other one saying, no, they are not, we are. So eventually, after a couple of rigged votes, they were thrown out. There was a new voting Kansas, which was down the road that the meet 131861 as a free state. So that's how that story plays out. And still around this time, something else happened that contributed him for her to inflame a public opinion on the issue of slavery. The same John Brown I mentioned earlier decided to launch a raid into the south to try to start as slave uprising, steal a bunch of weapons, hand them out to slaves and try to start as slave uprising. There were quite a few of his followers came with him. However, the whole plan went down in flames. Several of his followers were killed. Brown himself was wounded, eventually convicted of treason and hanged. Brown was mourned as a hero and as a martyr in much of the north, whereas in the south, they were extremely upset that this north turned support for Brown because they considered him a rebel and a traitor and a murderer. So, you know, when you have such separate opinion on just about everything, it's clear that things are now heading in a good direction. The election of 1860 will prove itself pivotal in this regard. The political parties, there's such tension over this election that when Abraham Lincoln won, and keep in mind, Abraham Lincoln was kind of a moderate because he was against what John Brown had done. He was against the notion of equality for black people, but he was also against the extension of slavery. Even though he was kind of a moderate, the fact that he was against the extension of slavery automatically made him an enemy in the south. So, when he won the 1860 election, shortly thereafter, South Carolina declared secession. They would break out from the union. They no longer wanted to be part of the union because they were afraid of being dominated by abolitionists. Several other states, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, also joined them in, joined South Carolina in this decision. And a few more Virginian or Carolina, Tennessee and Arkansas will join after the Civil War will break out. A few more slave states, specifically Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, which are kind of those slave states in between the North and the South, they had slavery, but did not join this movement to break away from the union. And you know, South earners at this time thought that the North would just accept this. They would let it go and there would be a new nation in the United States would break apart and there would be a United States, which would be the North, and we're known as the Combedre States of America, which would be the South. They elected their own president, a guy by the mouth of Jefferson Davis, and they thought that he was just gonna play out that way. Well, he won't. That was a big miscalculation because what they will have on their hands instead is the American Civil War. They will break out in 1861. In 1861, after South Carolina and several other states had declared that they would break away from the union. And they were in Lincoln said, yeah, that's not gonna happen. I'm not gonna allow it. There was a fort located on an island at the entrance of the Charleston Arbor, known as Fort Samter. He was still in union hands. He was still something that the union controlled and Lincoln was sending new troops and supplies to make sure the fort would be stable. But Jefferson Davis ordered his troops to take over the fort before these forces to resupply the fort would arrive. So in the battle that followed, the South was able to take Fort Samter and this was the very first fight of what's going to become the Civil War. Let's look at something real quick regarding the reasons for the Civil War. Let's be clear about something. Yes, he was about slavery and no, he wasn't about slavery. What do I mean by that? Okay, that's not been very clear. Let me try to clarify. The real big picture, I mean, there are a couple of quotes from Lincoln that I posted in the PowerPoint that should clarify this issue. In some way, it really wasn't about slavery. You know, Lincoln had said, I have no purpose to interfere with the institutional 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 that right there is telling you that that's not his main concern. He also stated, after the Civil War had begun, stated, my object in this struggle is to save the Union and is not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it. So right from the horse as my out, you get the opinion that slavery is not the central issue, keeping the Union together is the central issue. So while it is true that the primary reason for the Civil War is the clash between the power of the Federal Government and the power of the states, it's undeniable that a close second, and I do state that is a second, because again, you hear it here from Lincoln's words, but a very close second is the feta. What were the states and the Federal Government clashing about in this case? It was the issue of slavery. So while we cannot say this slavery was the primary reason for the Civil War, it's right next to it. Now, when the Civil War began, in the South, lots of people volunteered to fight and they expected that the North would not be able to put up a long fight, that they were a bunch of cowards, that they would not be able, they didn't care enough about it as much as the South did, and they would give up when facing difficulties. Most of the military sided with the South, however, the North and few other advantages. They, for one, that's where most of the weapon manufacturer was located. Also, they had more people to pick from. Now, both sides began recruiting volunteers, and eventually, as time went by, when they realized that they're just weren't enough volunteers, they instituted a draft. Now, as I mentioned, all of the South joined all of the North, stayed with the Union, some states in the middle, Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and Delaware, to be specific. They did have slavery, but some of them, they were kind of on defense on whether to stay with the Union or not. Delaware decided to stick with the Union. Maryland was divided. There was, Lincoln at one point declared martial law and arrested pro-souter leaders in Maryland without trial, which was kind of a violation of civil liberties, which Lincoln justified under the umbrella of national security. There were also many guerilla battles between pro-North and pro-South forces in Missouri. Some of the same communities were heavily divided. I mean, to give you an idea, even like three of Lincoln's brothers in law, they died fighting for the Confederacy. So the fact, however, that these forged slave states decided to stay with the Union definitely damaged the South. In the first major battle after force-um, during the bull run in Virginia, Union forces lost badly, and people quickly realized that this was not going to be as a painless conflict. This would actually be a more diverse, heavy conflict. The Civil War, all in all, is going to kill something in the neighborhood of 620,000 soldiers. Which is a huge amount of people. Way more than the United States will lose in most other war. About 25% of all the people who fought died in the Civil War. That's more than World War I and World War II combined. Granted, they were Americans fighting on both sides. Of course, everybody being killed, that's to the American numbers, but still. As I mentioned, the North had more people, more than twice the people that lived in the South, much more powerful industries produce all the guns. But most of the professional army officers sided with the South. Now, they also believed that slavery would help the South, because the slaves would continue to work while white-sigh South earners would fight. The South also believed that France and England would side with them, because they were buying cotton from them. So they would not want to lose that source for cotton. As it turns out, that's not going to happen. Because contrary to what they were hoping, both the British and the French decided not to get cotton from the South. They figured they would turn to other places in the world to get cotton. But opposition of slavery was too strong in Europe, including the UK and France at this time. So they were not going to actively side with the South. That was not going to happen. Lincoln, in the meantime, ordered a naval blockade of the South. He expanded the military budget without Congress approval. In one case, he reversed a decision made by a general to free slaves in Missouri. He said, no, no, no. This guy cannot be freed, because he was afraid that then Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, some of these slave states that sided with the Union would break apart. So he was trying to be fairly moderate about it. He was not, he definitely didn't want to be radical on this. As you may imagine, these led to some major conflict, both in the North as well as in the South. In the sense that one of the things that happened that you will see during the Civil War is a bunch of riots over the draft. People who did not want to go get recruited into this bloody conflict. They just didn't want to. They were upset about the injustice of rich people being able to buy their way out of it. In places like New York, you had these riots where primarily Irish workers were very mad to be recruited to fight in this extremely dangerous war for what, so that then there would be more African Americans competing with them for low-aged jobs. Definitely not something they were excited about, so they rioted over this. So in any case riots or not the war kept going on, and one of the strategies implemented by the Union, something that became known as the Anaconda Plan. The Anaconda Plan was a naval blockade to try to bolt at sea and on the Mississippi, to try to prevent the South from getting the supplies they needed to prevent their ships from going out or any ship from coming in. At first the Anaconda Plan was unsuccessful because the Navy was too small, but over time it became more efficient and started seizing most of the southern ships. By the way, one of the funniest things I've ever seen in a class, I had some class at some point many years ago I asked an exam question, what was the Anaconda Plan? And I had a student writing that the Anaconda Plan consisted in Abraham Lincoln ordering his troops to release a bunch of snakes in the South. I thought it was a genius answer, but in any case no, that's not really using a bunch of snakes, it was a naval blockade. Now the South didn't do too bad from a military standpoint, you know, they were, they won several battles. However, what became clear is that neither side was able to score at the size of victory quickly. You know, both northern troops and southern troops score victories back and forth. Ulysses Grant emerged as one of the top generals for the North and I mentioned his name because after the war he landed on becoming President of the United States, so what are you mentioning him? In the South, General Robert Eley emerged as one of the key generals in the South, but before we got caught into too many details, basically one of the things that we see is that after once the war began, some northern commanders began saying that the fugitive slave law no longer applied, it was no longer the law, they would not return slaves if they escaped from the to the north. So in light of this, a bunch of people, you know, as the news spread, more African Americans would try to escape to join the Union. As I mentioned, Lincoln's goal was not really the end of slavery, you know, he didn't like slavery personally, he was thinking and hoping that slavery would eventually fade away, but he wasn't going to risk the Union over this issue. However, his end was forced when southern states broke away, so that was his approach. Now eventually, in 1863, when despite various pleas with the South, the South refused to stop the war and return to the Union, in 1863 Lincoln passed what was known as the Emancipation Proclamation. Now many people think the Emancipation Proclamation was the end of slavery, it was not. The Emancipation Proclamation only freed the slaves in those states that were in a state of rebellion against the Union. It did not free states in those border states that were still loyal to the Union, so that just wasn't going to happen. The real abolition of slavery is not going to be until after the end of the war, but for the time being 1863 is a step in that direction, but not quite there. 1863 is also the time when Lincoln for the first time supported the recruiting black people into the army, to become soldiers in segregated units commanded by white officers, but nonetheless being the army. They were paid less than white soldiers, so some of them staged a rather curious form of protest, they said, don't you dare insult me by paying me less to take the same risks as white soldiers do. If you're gonna pay me less, don't even bother, just don't pay me at all, we're just gonna say that I do it because I want to, because I'm not going to accept to have a lesser value placed on my life than on the life of a white soldier. These became such a, you know, in this way they took such a moral high ground that many people among even Lincoln supporters were embarrassed by it, they thought these guys are right, and so they pressured the government to eventually pay them equally, so that was actually a very successful protest that they staged. All in all black soldiers represented about 10% of the Union army, many of them, some 37,000 of them died fighting. Now in the south, black soldiers were seen as the plague, they hated them. For a simple reason, there was even a case of a Southern congressman, when stated, if slaves make good soldiers, our whole theory of slavery is wrong. Now why would that be? What that means is, you know, the whole theory of slavery was built on the notion that one race was superior to another, and so it was only logical for the other to be the slaves because they were unfit to any grander task. But guess what, if African Americans can perform just as well as white people on the battlefield, and you know, military virtues were highly respected in the south as well, and so if African Americans can demonstrate they can be just as good as white soldiers, then the whole theory of black inferiority would begin to fall on its face. Never mind the fact that black guys with guns represented the nightmare of every slave owner, so not surprisingly, when African Americans soldiers were captured, they were usually massacred on the spot, they would not be kept prisoner. There's a famous case in 1863 in which some 262 African Americans soldiers were massacred upon surrender in Tennessee. Now the Civil War as a whole was very deadly, for one because the technology had improved, you know, now you had modern rifles as opposed to all the mascots in previous war. Strategy also hadn't kept up with the technology, so in many cases generals would just send their soldiers into these mass charges into enemy fire, which meant that many, many, many people were killed, but their idea was like, sure, punch will die, but hopefully enough of us survived to crush the enemy line. But also the one thing that killed the soldiers, even more than bullets, were doctors. I mean, as weird as it may sound, doctors killed more people than the enemy soldiers, because back then their ideas about hygiene were so terrible. The doctors often would not even wash their hands when treating the wounds of the soldiers, so even a minor wound that could lead to infection and death because of horrendously bad hygiene. So that's one of the things that caused an extremely high mortality rate during the Civil War. And also in some cases, the different sites were not very well equipped to deal with prisoners of war. For example, in the south in Georgia at a place called Andersonville, captured Union soldiers would die on a daily basis because of overcrowding. Over a hundred soldiers a day died because of malnutrition and exposure. So that's something else that contributed to this. By 1863, things were getting a little further south. The northern blockade was creating starvation in the south. But since the philosophy in the south was no government help, small government pick yourself up by your bootstraps, the government did nothing to intervene. And you know, the whole idea of small government, no government intervention sounded a lot better as long as people have food on the table. When they started starving, they liked it so much anymore. So in 1863, there were food riots in both Georgia and North Carolina. The southern army, the Confederate army was still winning in battle here and there. And they were hoping that maybe one big victory could turn the tide and convince England and France to support the south. So in the beginning of July 1863 in Pennsylvania, there was this huge battle at Gettysburg. Both sides suffered horrendously. Some 28,000 from the south died, 23,000 from the north. Despite the mass carnage, tactically the north won the battle and generally was forced to retreat. This was a turning point in the war, because this is when the tide began to turn clearly toward the north. This was followed up by a couple more victories for the Union army. And these convinced France and the England in case they any dubbed to not even think of supporting the south. And it also helped silence those critics of the war in the north. Those who were criticizing Lincoln for this war wanted peace, got quiet after all these victories. Grant, in the meantime, Elisa's grant had been nominated the general in chief of all the Union forces. He went after General Lee in Virginia. He started sending his troops in other southern states, places like Tennessee and so on. And the strategy there was to destroy as much property as possible in the south to force them to beg for peace. They would freeze leaves everywhere the Union army won. One of his subordinates, Sherman marched through Georgia and captured Atlanta in September 1864. So in 1864, also is the time when the presidential election was taking place. And Sherman captured in Atlanta and more of these military victories helped dramatically Abraham Lincoln to win the election. So as weird as it may sound, you know, anytime the Union army won a battle, Lincoln became more popular. Anytime they lost the battle became less popular, which is silly because of course, victory or defeating battle had nothing to do with him. But nonetheless, that's how he worked out. And in 1864, he worked out for him because the Union army was doing well and he won real action. By this point, the game was almost up. You know, by 1865, General Lee surrendered to Grant, who immediately pardoned him and his soldiers. Shortly thereafter in May, Jefferson Davis was captured in Georgia. The gig was up. Civil war was over. The South had lost to the Confederate states of America where no longer they would be forced to be brought back within the Union. So this nasty bloody war that had wrecked the United States was over. Abraham Lincoln would be in the president in charge during this war. Finally, feel like, ah, now I can relax. I think I deserve to abreak. I'm just gonna go to the theater and relax a little bit. So he went to a theater performance. And while he was there on April 14, 1865 was shot dead by John Wilkes Booth, who was a Southern sympathizer who clearly was not too fond of Lincoln. Lincoln become one of a few US presidents to be assassinated. The two most famous one. There were others, but the two most famous ones will be him. And John Fitzgerald Kennedy, there are eerie similarities between the Lincoln and Kennedy assassination. They happened 100 year apart. Both of them are killed on a Friday, hitting the head in front of their wives and a couple of friends, both at four kids, but only two surviving at the time of the assassination. The vice president for both was named Johnson. One was born in 1808, the other in 1908, who took over, but didn't run again after one term because they were very unpopular. There, the people who are supposed to have killed them, one John Wilkes Booth and the RVs, while one was born in 1839, one in 1939. You know, and it goes on and on. The coincidences are really downright weird. But in any case, the Civil War was officially over. Now we are going to see the next stage, what's known as reconstruction. And that's, Lincoln is not going to be there for it, because being murdered immediately at the end of the Civil War meant he would not be in a position to oversee reconstruction. There will be a clash now between Lincoln's vice president, Andrew Johnson, who now become the president and Congress. It is the issue with Andrew Johnson. What happened was this, that Lincoln had picked Johnson as his vice president, even though Johnson was different from him in just about every conceivable way. Whereas Lincoln was a Republican, Johnson was a Democrat. Normally you don't pick somebody from an opposite party to be your vice president. But we keep in mind again that the term Republican and Democrat, there's zero continuity between what the parties were back then and their core and political philosophies. In many ways, they are flipped because Republicans back then were pro-central government, more urban, whereas today's the other way and Democrats were more rural and more for state rights, and today tends to be more the other way around. But in any case, the point being Johnson was as loyal as one could be to the Southern Coast without openly breaking with the union. So why in the world would Lincoln pick such a guy to be his vice president? Well, he was being strategic about it. He figured at the time of civil war, I need to look like the guy who's the reasonable one and the Confederates are the crazy extremists. How do I look like the reasonable guy? Well, I can show that within my cabinet, I can have a plurality of opinions. I can even work with people who are very different from me and disagree with me in many ways. So I'll pick Johnson who's so different from me. It's gonna make me look good because I'm gonna look like the guy who's a moderate who listened to other people's advice even when it's not in line with these ideas. But a lot of these was really just for sure because the reality is what does the vice president do? Yeah, not a whole lot. Other than sitting around waiting for the president to die, the vice president has somewhat limited power. So Lincoln was figuring, I'm gonna do with these, which is more of a PR move, it's gonna make me look good and it doesn't really have any impact on actual policy. That's a brilliant plan except for when somebody put a bullet in your head and then the guy they were you are using purely for symbolic reason now become the president of the United States. So the second civil war was over. Now in charge of the federal government was a guy who was actually pretty sympathetic to the south. So there was a clash there between the senate wanting to push some fairly radical reform and the president constantly putting obstacles in this path. Things got so heated between the two sides that at one point the senate tried to impeach Johnson. Now the reason why they were impeaching was kind of an excuse just to get rid of him because of his political views and they only failed by one vote. So really really close. Despite these three amendments will be passed to the constitution changing the status of African Americans in the United States. The 13th, 14th and 15th amendment to the constitution they are respectively the 13th is the abolition of slavery. The 14th is given African American citizenship. The 15th give African American the right to vote. So again it's 13th abolition of slavery 14th citizenship 15th right to vote. Some people had wanted more reforms. For example one of the common ideas of the time was well it's great to eliminate slavery but you cannot take somebody who has been in slavery all their life and the older relatives have been in slavery all their life. So go ahead now you are free with nothing with no money no resources no nothing and hope that they'll do well because they are starting from the deepest of the deepest poverty and no education. So some people were calling for giving out parcels of land to each African American so that they could start by at least having a farm and being able to you know not start from just the deepest poverty possible but at least a couple of steps above. Then never passed. There was never something that they were able to push through. So while slavery was eliminated now thousands upon thousands of free African Americans were at no education and no money. To try to fix that at least partially the government established something known as the Friedman borough. The Friedman borough was basically a branch of the government that would try to facilitate the transition from slavery to freedom providing education doing things like that. Now the Friedman borough definitely it's better it certainly helped African Americans more than if it didn't exist at all but it was very far from being fully effective and achieving its goals. So you know nice step but not particularly effective. In any case back to the presidency the Andrew Johnson was so unpopular that by 1868 at the first available election he didn't even bother you know he knew that he wasn't going to be elected. So Republicans nominated instead one of their civil war hero the General Ulysses Grant and he will win the president in 1868 he will then win reelection in 1872. So he's in power for two terms for a full eight years. Now a couple of things that we should mention in regards to Grant and what happens after this and so on. Essentially what we see happening is this that the the enthusiasm for putting all this money into changing conditions for African Americans begin to fade away as time goes by. By the way this period of U.S. history following the end of the civil war in 1865 and all the way until 1877 at the end of the grants presidency is known as reconstruction. Reconstruction is basically literally the reconstruction of the United States after the split that had taken place during the civil war. You know building back from the confederate states of America and the Union putting them back together and reconstructing the United States. During this period of reconstruction Union forces remain stationed in the south to enforce all these changes that were happening both in the status of African Americans in the fact that the states had to be subordinate to the federal government and all this stuff. So that's something that clearly Southerners heavily resented they were very unhappy about this but there's not much they could do about it. However in 2004 reconstruction as I mentioned begins to fade away particularly in 1873 there's a major economic crisis that kind of you know when you have to tighten your belt to such a degree there's less willingness to spend so much money on these more idealistic programs. So after five years of the grant presidency and already eight years of reconstructions people were beginning to be less happy about putting money that wasn't there to begin with into reconstruction in the south. Fast forward to the election of 1876. The election of 1776 is going to be a crucial one for multiple reasons. You have on one side Hayes the Republican candidate and on the other side Tilden the Democratic candidate. The election is so close you know there was monstrous amount of fraud going on and there was a very close election with both guys claiming that they won. All these allegations of frauds had to be investigated based on these allegations each one could say that maybe they won. This is kind of a problem because this is happening only barely over a decade after the end of the civil war and you have two different guys claiming that they are the legitimate president of the United States. Clearly you can see how that's not a desirable situation. So in this context Tilden the Democratic candidate approached Hayes and offered him a deal. Essentially the deal went something like this. If Tilden was to concede and says that yes it was Hayes who won the election and just let it go. In return Hayes would have to put an end to reconstruction pull all federal troops out of the south and essentially abandon the status of African Americans in the south to the states. Hayes I think about it for 0.2 seconds say that sounds just great as long as I become president. So Hayes is elected he is president and the first thing he do when he comes into office in 1877 is signing off the end of reconstruction. So federal troops get out and reconstruction as we know it is over now. Here is the problem with this. The war construction wasn't really done. So many of the things that they were trying to accomplish were and fully were and done by this point. And without the supervision of the union southern states quickly moved in to reverse a lot of the gains that African Americans had made during reconstruction. Many of the rights that they are gained in the southern states quickly swooped in to take them back. So there is a direct link between the election of 1876 the end of reconstruction and the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 60s because essentially the civil rights movement is trying to finish what reconstruction had started and abandoned. A reconstruction gone on and been successful probably there wouldn't have been the need for a civil rights movement but the civil rights movement is directly tied to the failures of reconstruction. So let's look at a couple of the things that happened following the end of reconstruction. As I mentioned southern states will try to take back a lot of the rights that African Americans had gained. And there were two main strategies to accomplish that. One was through old-fashioned violence. You know, organizations like the KKK have been created immediately after the end of the civil war with the stated goal of using violence and terror to scare African Americans into giving up some of the rights. But federal troops stationed in the south during reconstruction squashed the KKK. However, at the end of reconstruction even though the KKK will not be reformed yet it's not going to be until 1915 that that happens. There are a bunch of other groups that why they don't call themselves the KKK. They basically take the same shape. They will engage in lots of violence to reduce the status of African Americans. I'll give you guys an example. Let's say that you have the right to vote. Well, that's just sweet. But if on the day when the elections are taking place and you show up at the polls, there's a mob of 50 guys with sticks. We're going to beat the leaving hell out of you if you try to cast a ballot. And the police is looking the other way and does nothing to stop them. Well, your right to vote is exist on on paper. It exists in theory. But doesn't really exist in reality. Or, you know, the stock the code of conduct that was expected for African Americans in the south was a very subservient one. If you meet a white person down the street, if you are walking down the street and they walk toward you, you have to step aside. You do not look them in the eyes who keep your eyes down. You know, you always had to keep these very subservient manners. Any African Americans who didn't could be targeted with violence. And one of the most classic forms of violence that characterized this period will be lynchings. Lynching's been illegal mob executions with no trial, no jury, and mob get together, grab somebody and murder him essentially. Lynching became so prevalent that it's estimated that there were probably about 5000 people lynched between 1882 and 1946 in United States. And 1940 will be the first year post reconstruction where there isn't a single case of lynching in U.S. which doesn't mean it's the end of lynching. It just means that it becomes rare enough that 365 days could go by without a case of lynching. So that's a really long time. That's decades and decades when it happens for the end of reconstruction. Well, part of the way, part of the reason why it was so prevalent is because the police basically never went after the people carrying out lynching. Hardly anybody would be caught or prosecuted the latter long convicted. That just did not happen. The police either looked the other way or in some cases the police themselves put some hoods on and participated into the lynchings. So moral of the story, lynching could be carried out with relative impunity. The standard justification that the people doing this stuff provided for lynching was usually an accusation of a black man raping a white woman. Now, I'm sure there were cases where that was true. But in many more cases, what they were targeting was either voluntary interracial sex, you know, not rape, but cases where white women and black men willingly had sex with one another. And so lynchings was done to kind of trying to enforce a sexual segregation or had nothing to do with sex at all, whether voluntary or not. It was in many cases, let's say African American family opened up a store that's giving competition to a white owned store. Well, the store owner and his friends would get together and go lynch his his competitor or somebody's not acting subservient enough, then a mob would gather and try to lynch them. So this was one of the strategy used to keep African Americans back. There's actually an interesting story about a group called the Association of Southern Women for the Prevention of Lynching. This was a group of Southern ladies who basically said, stop using us as an excuse to carry out lynching, stop saying that you're doing it to protect us. That is not what's going on, you're flat out line. And you know, in the context of the south to come out and say that that was very, that was a very gutsy move. So it's interesting that these ladies despite being southerners, despite leaving in the cultural context, organized to sort of deny the justification that was often provided for lynching. I mentioned though that there were two strategies to keep African Americans back. So one, we discuss was violence. The other one was a series of discriminatory laws. These were sometimes known as black codes, or sometimes also referred to as Jim Crow. These laws, however you call them, they are discriminatory nature. And they were laws that were passed targeting African Americans without explicitly saying that they were targeting African Americans. So what I mean by that is finding a way to not say that you're taking rights away from African Americans when that's exactly what you're doing. You just don't say it. Now, why can't you say it is because if you say it, then the federal government would have to intervene because you are violating federal laws. But if you don't explicitly say it, well, the federal government that clearly decided that they were not going to care about the status of African Americans in the South. So the message that the federal government gave to Southern states was basically look as long as you don't make it too obvious, as long as you don't force us to intervene, we'll just look the other way. Just be smart about it. Because last thing they wanted the federal government was to get into another civil war. So picking up on the message, Southern states passed some of these laws, for example, in order to take the right to vote away from as many African Americans as possible. Southern states began passing laws requiring minimum qualifications in terms of property and education. So you needed to have a minimum level of education, you needed to have a minimum level of income in order to vote. Why? Because, of course, coming from slavery, the majority of African Americans had low levels of education and no money. So that would take the right to vote away from most African Americans. Now, here is the problem. So the way the law was written, because you couldn't say they are only targeting African Americans, those laws also took the right to vote away from many poor and educated white people. Huh, what to do, what to do, because you want them to vote, you just don't want black people to vote. So the solution to that dilemma was to pass something known as the grandfather's close. The grandfather's close went something like this. The property and education requirement would stay in place, unless your grandfather had been eligible to vote prior to 1865. So there could be an exception could be made, even if you don't make the minimum requirement for education and income, you could still vote as long as your grandfather had been eligible to vote. Now, why 1865? Because back then, clearly, African Americans had no right to vote. So none of them had a grandfather who could vote. So perfect. Problem solved. You get rid of the black vote while you save the poor white vote. So that's an example of this kind of discriminatory laws. Another one that's interesting, given the Supreme Court got into it, in a very famous Supreme Court case known as Placie versus Ferguson. What happened in this one is that somebody had sued a South and railway saying that the train system there, the railway system, they had separate wagons for white people and black people, and they did not allow a black person to sit in the white section and so on. And the lawsuit said basically, hey, what is this? You cannot tell people where to see it based on skin color. The Supreme Court actually sided with this segregationist policy. They say, yes, you can. As long as you provide services for everybody, they don't have to be integrated services. They can be, they can be segregated. These become known as the doctrine of separate, but equal, that as long as you provide a service for everyone, you don't need to integrate. So this is the foundation that will allow a whole system of segregation to be created in the South from parks for white people and black people, water fountains for black people and white people and so on. Now, of course, this, by the way, was a lie because the whole equal, you know, separate for sure. That's what this law did equal clearly, not so much, because the kind of schools that black people would have access to were regularly weighing theory or to the schools for white people and so on. But for all intents and purposes, the Supreme Court legalized segregation and is not going to be until the mid 1950s in 1954 with Brown versus Board of Education that these ideas reversed and segregation becomes outlawed. So these are a couple of examples. Here's another one, something known as the convict lease system. The convict lease system went something like this. Let's say you're a plantation owner and you need the workers for your fields. Now you used to have slaves, now you can't have slaves no more. But here is what you can do, you can approach the state, you approach the state and say, look, if you release into my custody, X number of inmates, I will provide for security so that they don't escape, I will put a roof over their head and I will feed them. So the state doesn't have to pay all this costs. But I'll take care of it in exchange to recoup my losses, I will extract free labor out of them. So they're all gonna work for me. Now, because of the way the justice system was set up and because of extreme poverty, clearly they were vast, vast numbers of African Americans in prison at this time. So it could be, you know, late 1800s or even early 1900s and in some southern states you'd see black people in chain working in the cotton fields, which officially wasn't slavery but realistically for all intents and purposes was a good substitute for slavery. So this kind of stuff all characterizes the period post the end of reconstruction. Now, one thing that black people did following the end of reconstruction, well, actually, even following the end of the Civil War is lacking the land that they needed to start their own farm. Very often they got into something known as sharecropping, which basically meant a landlord, almost unfeelingly white, would let you live on a plot of land and you can put up your cabin there, you can live there, they will give you farming tools, seeds. You would farm, keep part of the harvest for yourself to live on and then another part would go to the landlord in rent. Then usually these contracts were required tenants to buy all their supply, their food, their clothes and everything from a store that the landlord operated, which of course having no competition meant they could charge pretty high prices resulting in essentially the landlord taking every single profit that was not, you know, anything that was not strictly necessary for survival, they would take. So realistically nobody ever became rich through sharecropping or rather the landlord probably did but definitely not the tenants. These however was better than nothing considering that there weren't exactly too many options at this time. Now the nature of course like this is to generalize because we're clearly taking a bird eye view of USC story, just kind of skimming through all the key events. But sometime I really don't like keep saying things like African Americans or white people implying like everybody was the same in those groups. So at least two in a minor way correct that impression. I want to give you an African American leadership in the late 1800s, early 1900s. And here we're going to look at the career of three guys with the spy tool being African American, the spy tool wanting the best for their people. They had very different ideas and different strategies about what was desirable. So there's a picture of these guys up in the PowerPoint. The first one Booker T. Washington. Booker T. Washington was a big believer in trying everything he could to improve the economic status of African Americans but not to insist on civil rights. And here is why. He felt that in order to improve the economic status of African Americans, you had to be friends with the so-called nice racists. Now what exactly are nice racists? Well the reality in US at the time is that racism was all over the place. So you are either dealing with really nasty racist, we either wanted you dead or to squash you or the nice racist were the ones where we linked well, you out economically, they were willing to throw you a bone as long as you act subservient. So as long as you don't challenge them on equality, then they could try to help you out. If you start saying hey we are on the same level as you were equal, they're racism would kick in and they would say well forget you done, no you're not and we don't like you very much. So Booker T. Washington argued that just you know play the subservient role. Let's let this richer white but nicer racist throw us a bone to help us climb out of poverty. Let's forget about civil rights because he would just anger them. On the other hand people like W.B. Du Bois, he represented a rare but existent case of a black middle class. He was one of the first African Americans to ever earn a PhD from Harvard. He in other words many of the people that he represented were not people were about to starve. They were African Americans of at least either lower middle class or middle class. So what they wanted was not just please get us some food for tonight. They wanted reality. They wanted civil rights. So he did insist on civil rights and that was more of his focus. Then you shift to a guy like Marcus Garvey. Garvey was a Jamaican immigrant and he believed the racism in US was such that there was no way that anytime soon he could go away. So he felt that African Americans should return to Africa. Now this was obviously a complicated concept because what do you mean the return you know African Americans none of them have been born in Africa. You're talking about generations prior no longer speaking the language or having any connection to the continent. That was not going to be exactly easy. And in fact very few people took him up on his message but what many people took him up on was the other side of his message was not a physical return to Africa was more of a spiritual and cultural one. So engaging with the idea that you don't have to copy Anglo culture to ever culture that it was okay to be proud of having a different taste in music food and just about every other aspect of culture you can think of. So this is something that clearly more people could embrace. My point being here you see three African American leaders who live in very different agendas and believe regarding what's desirable for their people. And so with this we wrap up this long long lecture on this other side of US history. There will be I believe at least another two more lectures that are going to be entirely US survey with no native component. This was one of them and probably I gotta guess two more coming up. In the meantime have a wonderful day.