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Abstract

This article analyses Enlightenment ideas and nation-making practices in the American Civil War and pre-War civil societies. It analyses African American mobilization and the abolitionist movement, and Lincoln’s role in war, reconciliation and development. The international context is investigated in a case for relational nation making. The role of non-violent mobilization is assessed. It examines the war’s social revolutionary implications. The war’s unprecedented violence anticipated 20th century total war, fundamentally deciding the republic’s future. State/civil society interactions, and changes in public moral perception, reshape longstanding institutional arrangements, and decide core ethical issues including the meaning of humanity.
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Enlightenment ideas, and modern nation-making practices, radically evolved in the American Civil War context. Like the French Revolution, or Indian National Independence, it was a uniquely constitutive moment in the Enlightenment heritage, marked by mass politics. It touched a revolutionary threshold: state collapse, destruction of an economic regime, and the creation of a new one. It involved a population hitherto excluded from citizenship (section 5). The war defied universal expectation: uncontrolled duration, tragic and revolutionary outcomes. Senator James Chesnut had promised to “drink all the blood that might be shed as a result of the Confederate declaration of independence” (Faust, 2008, p.18). The war subverted core 18th century Enlightenment premises, echoing the French Revolution, portending World War I as one of the earliest industrial wars. Revolution and Enlightenment intersected, the ideal heritage tested in lived reality. The social revolution fulfilled unrealized Enlightenment promises of the divided 1776 American Revolution. The revolution was locally subverted in counter-revolutionary patterns obstructing its promise for a century. Abolitionists in 1843 repealed the Massachusetts black/white intermarriage ban. Later, the Supreme Court (1967 Loving v. Virginia) negated the “anti-miscegenation” laws of the remaining Southern states (intermarriage was punishable by prison).

The American Civil War is investigated through global interactions (section 4): English abolitionism, the French Revolution, and the Caribbean revolutions. Modern revolutions are not uniform lines of intent (of a class, a people, an idea, etc.). Many-sided struggles shaped public consciousness. Transformed public moral perceptions informed grassroots struggle, impacting political heights in state action. Violent and non-violent nation-making alternatives competed. Military conflict grew from a larger world of purposeful but fragmentary everyday action, the new publics of modern technology (i.e. print industry).

Enlightenment and nation-making involved a hermeneutic battle in the Revolutionary American heritage, and an alternative counter-Enlightenment national path to modernity (section 3). Abraham Lincoln embraced Enlightenment in thought and conduct, inspired by its “economic and political ideas” (Guelzo, 2009, p. 9). He rose above a deadly conflagration in modern nation-making history. The life worlds were critical. Fragmented American civil society flourished, from popular religiosity (the Great Awakening) to natural law schools (informing Lincoln’s view). The Southern slave master’s authority encompassed plantations, court rooms, churches, private clubs and colleges. Mobilizing black populations, free black and slave, rejected exclusion from the citizen-human matrix under racist civil society and New World chattel slavery. Abolitionist and Civil War black Americans fought an ontologically sanctioned caste system of the counter-Enlightenment tradition (a slave labour/master race hierarchy).
The European Enlightenment was revolutionized by the American Civil War, its racist ontology negated through practice. It unbandaged the double heritage of Enlightenment and slavery (section 2), entrenched in venerable canons (i.e. Aristotle's defence and the traditional Biblical linkage). The archetypal moment, the 1865 slave liberation at Richmond jail by black Union soldiers, still resonates from the Richmond-Petersburg Campaign (nine months of trench warfare) which led to Robert E. Lee’s surrender at Appomattox.

It was a history of national consciousness: a new Southern master class consciousness, a combative black American rights-entitlement consciousness, and Northern identity distinct from old Europe. Institutional carriers included technology and industrial capitalism, market exchange, trans-Appalachian steamboats, canals, and railroads, as well as mass movements and intellectual tendencies. Amartya Sen’s component model of intellectual change is used, rather than essentialist conventions (Sen, 2000, p. 233-4). The Civil War pitted Enlightenment and counter-Enlightenment national modernization visions: egalitarian humanist versus divinely hierarchic. Embracing the “universality of freedom”, Lincoln fought for the Constitution at the national level, to promote industrial development and concentrate national power (Guelzo, 2009, p. 113). The democratic system, enmeshed in civil society conflicts, demonstrated the experimental character of the U.S.A. Despite Lincoln’s death, post-Civil War America combined mass democracy with rapid development (Bensel, 2000, p. 1-19).

**Slavery and Enlightenment**

Slavery grounded New World development economic institutions, preceding Enlightenment ethical discourses and practices. West African slaves built history’s first global production system and mass market (sugar, tobacco, coffee, chocolate, dye-stuffs, rice, hemp, and cotton). By the 16th century, the Atlantic Slave System crystallized, flooding Spanish Florida and Virginia with human cargo (1560-1619). It launched the Sugar Revolution of British Barbados. England’s New York (after 1664) had a 20 percent slave population, its mid-18th century slaves performing one-third of physical labour (carpentry, blacksmithing, shoemaking, stone working, butchering, milling, weaving, and goldsmithing). Rural slaves built roads, cleared land, cut timber, and herded cattle (Davis, 2006, p. 129). Nineteenth century New World slavery was modernized and capitalist, an intensive labour system of maximal production for international markets.

At America’s Revolutionary eve, 1770, legal slavery was accepted in the New World. William Lloyd Garrison, later, was deemed eccentric by mainstream voices. 1888 Brazilian emancipation completed Western Hemisphere illegalization. History’s first antislavery societies were small clusters in Philadelphia, London, Manchester, and New
York. New World slavery’s end followed “a major transformation in moral perception” engendered by “the emergence of writers, speakers, and reformers, beginning in the mid-eighteenth century” (Davis, 2006, p. 1). The Enlightenment tradition produced a major transformation in public ideas and values through everyday human organizational efforts.

Slavery and secular republican beliefs conflicted. Three impact points pit the Enlightenment heritage and the chattel institution: the 1776 American Revolution, the 1789 French Revolution and Britain’s 1830s peaceful emancipation of eight hundred thousand colonial slaves. The American Revolution, for nationalist and economic development purposes, consolidating a cultural interclass unity among whites (i.e. Virginian planters co-opted white workers under the unifying banner of republican liberty and white identity) (Morgan, 1975, p. 386). Enlightenment ideals troubled Anglo-Americans regarding slavery’s cosmic immutability. The 1776 Declaration of Independence stated that “all men are created equal”. Jefferson, with children by a slave, was silent on slavery in the Declaration in “deference to his fellow Southerners, and Northerners who were profitably engaged” (Tulloch, 2006, p. 72, 1). Slaves were freed and armed as a British war tactic, many thousands escaping. Northern slaves demanded freedom in natural rights language, echoing “British tyranny” discourses. A New Hampshire slave, witnessing combat and revolutionary rhetoric, told his master: “you are going to fight for your liberty, but I have none to fight for.” (Keysarr, 2000, p. 12-14). Post-Revolutionary Americans, however, legislated the antebellum segregation system (from 1815, manumission was excluded) (Davis, 2006, p. 3). The federal government projected eradication within a twenty-year Constitutional restraint (by 1808). Abolition, immediate in northern New England, was gradual from Ohio to the Mississippi River. The slaveholding South, encircled, might have retracted, but for technological fortuities boosting profitable slavery (i.e. the cotton gin) and the 1803 Louisiana Purchase. The 1776 American Revolution harboured a second potential revolution, rooted in the contradiction of Enlightenment ideals and enslavement of the population.

The French Revolution politicized doomed slave revolts (emancipatory ideology linked to a major state); and, secondly, provided a unique revolutionary opportunity in state collapse (historically, slave rebellions were suicidal without prior state collapse). In 1792, the new French Legislative Assembly decreed full equal rights for free blacks and mulattoes in the colonies (Doyle, 2012, p. 412). The discursive foundation of British West Indian political order and economic production tilted. Bourbon state collapse permitted the successful Haitian Revolution (1791-1804). British mass public pressure was a second condition for effective rebellions. Organized struggles over public ethics undermined the moral legitimacy of global slave regimes (linked to official ideologies of free labour and new consumer markets). Non-violent uprisings, and an international
network of states and publics, pushed British power towards legislated abolition (see section 4). This anticipated an alternative permutation in the Enlightenment tradition of mass political action, in non-violent direct action. Modern non-violence was born in the anti-slavery struggle.

Civil Society and Modernization: apocalypse and human

The Civil War was rooted in the civil societies of Northern and Southern states, based in uneven national modernization. Deracinated populations sought political and cultural solutions. The “conflict above the Mason-Dixon Line [was] between anti-materialist, pre-bourgeois values and the ‘cash-nexus’ at the center of the modern civilization”. We see “conflicts of tradition and modernity, of human and material values, of science with religion”, “problems in social philosophy and values confronting all Americans of this era” (Faust, 1981, p. 20). New movements negotiated the unfamiliar industrial world. Post-Revolutionary relativism had politically sustained America, the South controlling government. Northern appeasement occluded the contradictions that John Quincy Adams articulated during his nine-year battle with the House of Representatives’ “gag rule” (against antislavery petitions or during the 1839-40 Amistad trials) (Meyers, 2005, p. 46-62).

Southern slavery meant wealth accumulation, as “the most successful masters cornered an increasing share of the growing but limited supply of human capital” (Davis, 2006, p. 198). Cotton exports reached $29.6 million (1830), then $191.8 million (1860). The South grew over 60 percent of world cotton (1840), supplying Britain, New England, Europe and Russia - over half the value of all American exports, providing the majority of national imports and investment capital. With the newest technology, it allocated slave labour in regional infrastructure construction (diverse agriculture, mining, lumbering, canal and railroad building, textile manufacture, iron and other industries). The Confederacy fought to perpetuate economic advantage (Davis, 2006, p. 84). Slaveholding Southern Democrats owed power to the constitutional “three-fifths” (three-fifths of the slave population counted in elections). In Northern cities, 1820s economic growth outpaced the South. Dislocated Northern populations embraced revivalist movements. Second Great Awakening leaders saw, not progress, but the ordained path to New Jerusalem obstructed. 1830s abolitionism, 18th century Enlightenment inspired, combined this revivalist heritage. Second Great Awakening converts, seeking a correct Christian life, demanded immediate abolition (1830-1833). A national sin, like duelling, intemperance and Sabbath-breaking, slavery signalled Armageddon. Critics were often silent on Northern slavery (New York to 1827; Connecticut to 1848), seeing colonization (return of free blacks to Africa) as the means to averting civil war (following the American Colonization Society, Liberia, 1821–22).
The politicians in this “era of mass, participatory democracy responded all too well to the major concerns of their constituents”. The South demanded that slavery “be federally protected and allowed to expand westwards”; the North demanded “free soil, free labour and free men”. Pre-Civil War Northerners rallied around “a new, sectional party, the Republicans” (Tulloch, 2006, p. 2). The mass democratic mechanism unexpectedly exited the game of politics into total war. Deeply religious views grounded a “providential understanding of not only the war but also everyday life”; “storms, harvests, illnesses, deaths … unfolded according to God’s will”. For “clergy and laity alike, the war became a holy crusade”. A sacred-violence-truth triangle justified Civil War in a providential narrative. A Confederate artillerist said: “Our president and many of our generals really and actually believed that there was this mysterious Providence always hovering over the field and ready to interfere on one side or the other.” Religious authenticity was evoked in condemning southern churches: “what passed for religion there only mocked genuine Christianity” (Rable, 2010, p. 2, 8, 13). Manifest Destiny justified the Mexican War (1846-48) land grab. The apocalyptic vision flourished in the Civil War “rhetoric of service—to nation, to God, to comrades”, rationalizing “violence (...) by casting it as the instrument of both nationalist and Christian imperatives” (Faust, 2008, p. 21).

Unlike France, the United States experienced the centrifugal power of barely organized religion. From the late 18th century, “religious life had become increasingly entwined with soaring hopes for the United States.” Lacking central authority, “the churches themselves became part of the great American experiment in representative government.” Official religion upheld the status-quo, while unofficial movements polarized. Mission groups, reform societies, and Sunday schools raised money and proselytized, organizing ‘anti-materialist’ public campaigns against sins (alcoholism, poverty), with slavery their primary target (ontological not sociological). For Garrison, the nation faced “damnation or salvation” (Rable, 2010, p. 25, 13). Among slaves, religion was collectively crucial, as surviving but hidden African religions (i.e. voodoo) and Islam melted into a belated Christian conversion on the eve of and after the war (Fountain, 2010, p. 114).

Southern proslavery, a counter-Enlightenment ideology (1830s, 40s, and 50s), condemned egalitarian philosophies and exploitative capitalism alike (i.e. Locke’s contractual theory; the Founders’ vision). Organic society attested to Southern uniqueness and superiority. The Revolutionary heritage was "well-sounding but unmeaning verbiage of natural equality and inalienable rights". The slave, "fed, clothed, protected," was “better off than the northern factory worker”. They cited industrial child labour and prostitution. Hierarchy gave spirituality to national existence: “Those who have looked most closely … know how great a portion of human misery is derived
from ... the undecided and wavering purpose”. A Nietzschean argument, the master class required leisure for civilizational heights. Capitalism and egalitarianism represented decline, after slave-based Greek and Roman ideals. It was a secularized religious vision. “Evangelical stewardship” – comparably to the Ottoman Empire – embodied Providence. Slavers had “been chosen as the instrument, in the hand of God, for accomplishing the great purpose of his benevolence” (Faust, 1981, p.79, 12, 110, 13). The “parties in the conflict are not merely abolitionists and slaveholders” but “atheists, socialists, communists, red republicans, Jacobins, on the one side, and friends of order and regulated freedom on the other”. The “world” was a “battle ground” between “Christianity and Atheism”, “the progress of humanity at stake” (James Henley Thornwell) (Rable, 2010, p. 13). Natural law concepts yielded to Joseph de Maistre’s principle of social organicism (Faust, 1981, p. 12). The Republic was fractured by a mass movement upholding divinely sanctioned hierarchy over secular egalitarian ideals.

Abolitionist Biblical appeal was in spirit, not the letter (the holy word upheld slavery), some abandoning religious appeals (Rable, 2010, p. 27). Secularism’s deepest cause was in the existential struggle over humanism. An economically and socially important population struggled for recognition as human beings. Frederic Douglass, escaped Maryland slave turned leader, upon learning to read (it being legally prohibited), affirmed the Enlightenment knowledge-liberty link: “Knowledge opened my eyes”; “I have often wished myself a beast, or a bird— anything, rather than a slave”. Yet, with “knowledge”, his “spirit was roused to eternal wakefulness” of “Liberty” as “the inestimable birth right of every man” (Douglass, 2008, p. 154-55). Recognition of black slaves as human beings, identical in rights entitlement to Europeans fighting emancipatory wars, was grave. Thomas Roderick Dew stated: “in the plenitude of their folly and recklessness, [some] have likened the cause of the blacks to Poland and France”. William Harper ridiculed abolitionism: “Who but a drivelling fanatic, has thought of the necessity of protecting domestic animals from the cruelty of their owners?” These polemics acknowledged a disrupted conventional circle of ethical consideration, expanded by post-Enlightenment secular humanism: “The French revolution had kindled a blaze throughout the world” (Faust, 1981, p. 59, 98, 68).

The Enlightenment imaginings of slaves and ex-slaves subverted even Lincoln’s original hopes for a colonial or appeasement solution. Active black agency transformed Abolitionism to favour national integration and shared citizenship, replacing the ACS Liberian project. The “new, radical white abolitionism of the early 1830s was much indebted to the earlier militancy of anti-colonization blacks”. Black abolitionists maintained the Underground Railroad, fugitive slave flight into non-slave states or Canada, the material infrastructure. William Lloyd Garrison read the first black newspaper (1829), and became convinced that abolitionism must promote equal
coexistence (Davis, 2006, p. 258-9). African American hegemonic victory was public acknowledgment of a common civil nationality based on equality. Secondly, national redirection occurred more accidentally through Civil War logistics, the war aim becoming abolition rather than regional containment of Southern slavery (section 5).

Black abolitionist David Walker’s *Appeal to the Coloured Citizens of the World* (1829) expressed interpenetrating Enlightenment and religious mobilization. He invoked divine punishment: “Whether you believe it or not, I tell you that God will dash tyrants, in combination with devils, into atoms, and will bring you out from your wretchedness and miseries”. He evoked violent retribution through human agency: “woe, will be to you if we have to obtain our freedom by fighting”. Walker underlined the humanist stakes of social acknowledgment: “they have to raise us from the condition of brutes to that of respectable men”. He used natural rights language (“remember that your freedom is your natural right”), and archetypal French Revolutionary imagery (“we must and shall be free and enlightened [or] obtain our liberty by the crushing arm of power”) (Waldstreicher, 2001, p. 76-78). A Boston used clothing dealer, he sewed pamphlets into coats for southern markets, provoking the banning of the pamphlets and mass arrests.

1830s abolitionism attained mass proportions, transforming public consciousness. The American Anti-Slavery Society distributed 122,000 pamphlets in 1834, and 1.1 million in 1835. By 1838, 1,346 local antislavery associations had 100,000 members. Black activist Maria Stewart (1832) demanded access to scientific knowledge: “[T]here are no chains so galling as those that bind the soul, and exclude it from the vast field of useful and scientific knowledge”. (Waldstreicher, 2001, p. 78-79). Peter Osborne (1832) invented civil rights vocabulary: “The Declaration of Independence has declared to man, without speaking to color, that all men are born free and equal.” (Waldstreicher, 2001, p. 86). 1840s northern free blacks demanded the vote, disfranchised since 1821 (black men had previously voted for decades following a 1777 convention). From 1840, they strategized and passed resolutions reproduced in abolitionist newspapers (Waldstreicher, 2001, p. 82).

Shaken North-South equilibrium ended the silence on slavery. Southern opponents built a “virtual iron curtain around the South” (Davis, 2006, p. 263). By the 1850s, amidst hate and fear, Northern industrial and Southern trade integration persisted (slave-grown cotton, rice, hemp, tobacco, and sugar). Slaves escaped by the thousands across the frontier, as the United States became divided by a 19th century Berlin Wall. The Fugitive Slave Law, of the 1850 Compromise (admitting California as a free state), tarnished the Northern image of freedom. Federal “kidnappers” dragged escaped slave Anthony Burns through Boston streets, provoking mass civil disobedience. One hundred thousand dollars, and fifteen thousand soldiers, to escort
him through crowds of fifty thousand to forcible Virginian return (Davis, 2006, p. 265). The 1854 Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society rally drew thousands. Dred Scott, brought as property to free territories, attempted to sue for his freedom (1857). The court held that blacks lacked standing in federal court. Natural rights conflicted with property rights, concerning inclusion within legal citizenship and the moral category of ‘humanity’. Abolitionists increasingly advocated violence, predicting cataclysm to exterminate slavery and unify mankind. The French Revolutionary pattern of modern violence ascended with a religious aura.

Among intellectual elites, Henry David Thoreau’s plea for Captain John Brown celebrated terrorist practice to effect social change. His writing transformed Brown into a peerless cultural hero, united with a larger cause. Brown’s martyrdom and vitality contrasted the “dead existence” of his critics. Thoreau demanded whether conformists were “truly alive” (Thoreau, 2003, p.8-9). An element of romantic vitalism, not unlike Bergson’s sublimated “quality”, permeated American thought. Being was fundamentally re-examined as intellectuals explored Indian philosophical themes such as metaphysical emptiness. New England Transcendentalism challenged dogmatic religious truths, based on scientific Enlightenment. Ralph Waldo Emerson (1830s), at Harvard, rejected Christ’s divinity: “I regard it as the irresistible effect of the Copernican astronomy to have made the theological scheme of Redemption absolutely incredible” (Faust, 2008, p. 194). Emerson celebrated a unique American identity in secular terms, “the infinitude of the private man”. He argued that “the sacredness of traditions” were “from below, not from above”. In ethics, “Good and bad are but names very readily transferable to that or this” (Emerson, 1950, p. 148). Justice, however, was paramount in Emerson’s passionate abolitionism. Nature was mystically linked to the Over Soul, something immortally beautiful. We habitually mistake our ego for the Self. Despite such romanticism, Emerson privileged everyday life over higher revelations: “My life is superficial, takes no root in the deep world, [exchanging] this flash-of-lightning faith for continuous daylight”. (Emerson, 1950, p. 100). Emerson supported Civil War, affirming violence to effect national rebirth: “Civil war, national bankruptcy, or revolution, [are richer] than languid years of prosperity” (Emerson, 1860, p. 230). Herman Melville’s Moby Dick (1851) suggested a non-essentialist identity between America’s diverse races: “there is no quality in this world that is not what it is merely by contrast. Nothing exists in itself” (Melville, 1994, p. 68). Popular abolitionism, also, combined secular with apocalyptic religious beliefs, and Enlightenment natural rights philosophy. Lincoln was distinct from the abolitionists in viewing the problem as “an economic one, rather than an evangelical or moralistic one”. His secular approach contrasted with popular abolitionism, for whom evangelical Protestantism was the conceptual matrix (Guelzo, 2009, p. 93-94), or the quasi-religious Transcendentalist visions.
The Abolitionist Movement, Non-violence and 19th century global interconnections

Global material and cultural linkages - English abolitionism, the French Revolution, the Caribbean revolutions, and the American Civil War - disclose nation-making as relational rather than essentialist. The Atlantic Slave System was confronted by the slaves themselves, whose only form of struggle for freedom was revolt (nearly always entailing death) or escape. Secondly, there was abolitionism within the public realm based on the category of citizenship. Citizens, ensured participation through impersonal political rights secured by the state, were permitted access to diverse organizational forms (political parties, economic organizations etc.). This system of power sharing derived from the Enlightenment heritage, whose theorists compared slavery metaphorically to conditions of government without consent.

The geographically remote social universes of slave and citizen merged in a wider abolitionist struggle. Abolition was “the product of the interaction between developments within Britain and events in the colonies” (Midgley, 1995, p. 10). The first front, the slave struggle, had historical priority (Barbados in 1675, violent but hopeless; one hundred suspected conspirators were arrested of whom fifty-two were executed). In 1692, leaders were arrested and tortured before execution, revealing organized rebel military units with appointed leaders (aiming to capture firearms, horses, and ships, seize the island, and kill most white men). Following the failed 1701 conspiracy, major slave revolts declined for a century (Postma, 2008, p. 51).

Legal anti-slavery struggle, meanwhile, began with Pennsylvanian Dutch and German Quakers in 1688. The English anti-slavery movement emerged in 1727, slightly later in the Americas (1750s). Despite Quaker roots, the London-based Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade was organized on a non-denominational basis (1787). This practical means to expanded support created a secular basis and common end. Non-violent tactics involved anti-slavery books, pamphlets, organized lecture tours, staged mass rallies and parliamentary petitions. It derived from a spectrum of religious, intellectual and political movements (i.e. 18th century British Enlightenment and Anglicanism). Freedom was “equated with a capitalist system operating in a colonial context and with a Christian society moulded on British lines”. Gradualism was espoused, until Leicester Quaker abolitionist Elizabeth Heyrick’s 1824 landmark pamphlet “Immediate, not Gradual Abolition” (Midgley, 1995, p. 101-2). It originated in black anti-slavery resistance within Britain. Runaways in London, Bristol and Liverpool formed communities, some joining artisan organisations in the 1790s. A London magistrate, in 1768, charged that they “corrupt and dissatisfy the Mind of every fresh black Servant that comes to England”, urging “them to demand wages for their services” (Midgley, 1995, p. 12). Denied citizenship, they organized struggle for minor
empowerment, public recognition and resource access, their actions linked to wider public activist networks. Black resistance sparked the first white action by Granville Sharpe in the 1760s-70s. The combined effect ended slavery inside of England by the 1790s. Intermarriage further attests to the “artificiality of separating black and white civil society at this germinal moment in the British Abolitionist movement” (Midgley, 1995, p.11-12).

British anti-slavery had transatlantic linkages: early 18th century British and American Quakers criticized the slave trade. The 1789 autobiography of Olaudah Equiano, an account of enslavement and escape, revealed family destruction to the British public: “a day of greater sorrow than I had yet experienced; for my sister and I were then separated ... for several days I did not eat anything but what they forced into my mouth” (Waldstreicher, 2001, p.18). In Manchester, 1787, 10,639 signed a petition, with 10 percent female subscribers. The first national petition campaign followed in 1788, the total signatures nearing one hundred thousand. In 1791, abolitionist William Wilberforce introduced the first anti-slave trade Bill. Clarkson’s Committee travelled, raised funds, lobbied and wrote anti-slavery works. The estimated four hundred thousand who signed petitions in 1792 represented 13% of the adult male population of England, Scotland, and Wales. The abolitionist movement thus transformed public perceptions in the world’s most economically advanced nation (Davis, 2006, p.234).

The French Revolution (1789-99) polarized the Enlightenment heritage and illuminated slave struggles with brutal immediacy. It catalysed post-1790 American slave revolts, particularly with abolition in the French Empire (1794). In the French colony Saint-Domingue (Haiti), it ignited a mass slave insurrection (1791 to 1804). In 1804 revival of anti-slave-trade agitation swept Britain, with Napoleon’s slave trade restoration. French extermination attempts upon revolutionary Haitians, to repopulate the island with ‘uncorrupted’ African slaves, showcased the system’s murderousness (Davis, 2006, p.168). In 1814, the Napoleonic Wars ending, abolitionists collected 750,000 names demanding that England force France to abolish its slave trade (the 1815 Congress of Vienna produced only empty condemnation). The Haitian revolution was Enlightenment-inspired: “The slaves’ capture of “the spirit of the thing” [Liberty, Equality and Fraternity] ... a revolutionary ideal of universal human rights had entered the Caribbean at the end of the eighteenth century ... one of the explosive borders of enlightened modernity” (Munro & Walcott-Hackshaw, 2006, p.10). The Haitian Revolution demonstrated that the “the most abject, helpless, and degraded of mankind” could organize to transform their future (Davis, 2006, p.159). Slaves were aware of what Haiti represented: Southern planters suppressed information, while an influx of Saint-Domingue slave refugees spread knowledge through Louisiana. It inspired the 1800 and 1802 Virginian slave conspiracies, the 1811 rebellion reaching within
eighteen miles of New Orleans. By the 1820s, blacks in Northern cities celebrated the anniversary of Haitian independence. The Haitian Revolution, pressuring Congress to outlaw the American slave trade in 1807, and patterning early ACS and abolitionist politics, shaped America’s national road.

Non-violence was practiced in three major Antilles slave insurrections: Barbados (1816), Demerara (1823), and Jamaica (1831). Thousands of slaves participated with few whites killed. Leaders practiced restraint and discipline. Communication networks spread word of British public opinion, and “British slaves thus ... focused their violence on property [and took] extraordinary measures to avoid the killing of whites”. The Demerara rebellion spoke in Enlightenment terms of “rights”, refraining from killing captured masters. With the Jamaica slave insurrection, British antislavery had expanded on the strength of nonviolent Caribbean insurrections. Sugar estates destroyed, but “not one freeman’s life was taken, not one freewoman molested by the insurgent slaves.” Leaders urged followers “to not to harm them except in self-defence” (Davis, 2006, p. 219-20). The Jamaica rebellion resulted in fourteen white deaths (one-quarter the number killed by Nat Turner). As Davis has argued, “Turner and other American rebels had no possibility of appealing to a strong, centralized government that showed increasing sensitivity to a burgeoning antislavery movement”. Non-violence aided the British abolition movement, “which would surely have suffered a setback if Jamaican blacks had followed the example of Haiti and had massacred hundreds of whites”. America’s Southern planters linked insurrections to British abolitionism, condemning “the momentous danger of tolerating any similar abolitionism in the Northern states”. In 1827, a Southern planter argued that discussion of slavery in Congress would cause “DEATH and DESTRUCTION in the South,” just as the Parliamentary debates had incited West Indian insurrectionary movements (Davis, 2006, p. 220-1).

As Britain peacefully emancipated colonial slaves in the 1830s, arguably violating economic self-interest, the Southern United States was consolidating an increasingly authoritarian society under parallel pressures. Events converged within an international pattern of linkages. A planned slave revolt in the American South set for Bastille Day in 1822 testifies to causal powers inhering in implicit global social relations, informing a context-dependent practical consciousness.

**The Course of the War, Social Revolution and military-industrial crystallization**

The American Civil War ended slavery, redefining the Enlightenment concepts freedom, citizenship, and equality in U.S. history’s conflicting potential paths. It created a newly centralized nation-state launched upon a path of economic expansion and world influence (Faust, 2008, p. 12). The United States colonial nightmare was within its borders, rather than overseas (i.e. using Indians in tracking fugitive slaves, and blacks to
raid Indian camps). The Republic’s expanding borders encompassed a newly independent Southern Confederacy, the world’s greatest slave power, the size of Europe. Paramount global dimensions entailed that the world watched the conflict unfold with baited breath.

The 1861 Fort Sumter bombardment by Confederate forces launched the war, with cotton export cut to pressure global recognition (Britain turned to India and Egypt). With Union demoralization, at the second battle of Bull Run (1862), Britain and France contemplated granting diplomatic recognition. The 1862 capture of New Orleans (the largest Confederate city, cosmopolitan, French speaking, flourishing with industrialism and the gold rush) was a major turning point for the Union. The war turned, secondly, with the accidental 1862 discovery of a lost Confederate letter in a Maryland field. Detailing tactics of Lee’s Northern Virginian Army, this impacted the Battle of Antietam by repelling Lee’s invasion and probably preventing “European intervention that would have perpetuated American slavery for an indefinite period” (Davis, 2006, p. 316). This was the “bloodiest day of the Civil War with over 23,000 dead or wounded”, “a quarter of Lee’s army” (Tulloch, 2006, p. 141). It reduced the Confederacy to irreversible disadvantage. Lincoln, seizing the opportunity, declared a preliminary Emancipation Proclamation. He had waited, enduring depression, until “the military situation and public opinion in the North might make such a decree effective and not self-defeating” (Davis, 2006, p. 313).

Lincoln’s war opposed illegal dismemberment of the United States. Until 1862, he upheld colonisation, citing “an unwillingness on the part of our people, harsh as it may be, for you free coloured people to remain among us” (Tulloch, 2006, p. 147). Lincoln then realized the indispensable importance of black soldiers: “I believe it is a resource which, if vigorously applied now, will soon close the contest. It works doubly, weakening the enemy and strengthening us.” No black soldiers were citizens (until the 1868 14th Amendment). In 1862 black regiments marked public consciousness with heroic combat at Fort Wagner. By 1865 “over 190,000 black troops, constituting 10 per cent of the total Union forces, one-fifth of the male black population under 45 had joined 166 different regiments involved in 40 major battles, with a further 10,000 in the navy” (Tulloch, 2006, p. 140). Fort Wagner and Antietam led to the 1862 preliminary Emancipation Proclamation. The war effort, previously for Union, targeted black freedom. The 1865 13th Amendment formally liberated slaves. Expected to endure briefly, war reached a logistical depth where the procurement and maintenance of personnel imposed a revolution in social relations. Transcending the ideological anticipations of the powerful, it affirmed the collective desires of disempowered populations in a revolutionary meaning. At the War’s onset, abolitionist views remained
marginal. By the end, all demands had been met in a sociological (rather than Providential) pattern of change.

The American state (unlike Britain) lacked the centralized authority to decide the slavery issue. The notion of slavery naturally withering away lost credibility. In this context, we see the creation of the Republicans, party of “free soil” in the West, and the rise of Lincoln. Lincoln, Kentucky slave state born, and raised among Indiana Southerners, attacked slavery in 1837. In 1854, he argued: “no man is good enough to govern another man, without that other’s consent”, this being “the sheet anchor of American republicanism.” A political moderate, he was committed to “the dictates of prudence” (Davis, 2006, p. 307). Abolitionism was “excessively self-righteous”, but, in his 1858 “House Divided” speech, he declared no middle way for the Republic. A “crisis” had to be “reached and passed”. The nation, unable to “endure permanently half slave and half free”, must become “all one thing or the other”. A “conspiracy”, the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska act and 1857 Dred Scott decision, constituted a “design and concert of action” seeking to institute slavery nationwide (Lincoln, 2000, p. 719-22).

Lincoln’s 1861 electoral victory provoked seven Southern state secessions, led by traditionally slaveholding coastal regions. The Confederacy (11 states) formed at Montgomery, Alabama, with Jefferson Davis as president (claiming the right of states to autonomy without federal interference). For the slave owning planters, Lincoln’s threat to the economy was comparable to the 1848 French revolution and British emancipation (which had inspired expectations of an “immediate black revolution, as presaged by the great Jamaican slave revolt of 1831”). Many viewed American abolitionists as British agents. One Southern woman’s (1861) letter described the British West Indies as a twenty-seven year “window” to view the disaster of slave emancipation. Only resistance war could prevent similar socio-economic ruin for the South. Misguided reformers inflamed public ignorance, risked the annihilation of plantation life, millions of dollars in property, and an entire civilization (Davis, 2006, p. 282-3). These collectively imagined terrors illuminate broader international linkages conditioning unfolding events.

The Union had material advantages: a population of 22 million as against 9 million (of whom 4 million were slaves), and an industrial capacity ten times greater. Lincoln’s leadership followed the human multitude – the tens of thousands of escaped slaves arriving in the North (a humanitarian disaster) were transformed into the military solution (i.e. Union army black soldiers). The Emancipation Proclamation recognized the right of slave insurrection, saying “the executive government of the United States … will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons” (Waldstreicher, 2001, p. 157). Lincoln affirmed slavery’s abolition as a fundamental war aim, or a "new birth of freedom," in the 1863 Address following the Battle of Gettysburg.
(the greatest battle of the war) (Lincoln, 2000, p. 1275). Union slavery ended with the Thirteenth Amendment (1864), the Fourteenth extended full citizenship (1868), and the Fifteenth granted voting rights to adult males (1870) in the last of the Reconstruction Amendments. A civil war is fought between co-citizens along political or other lines, and a revolution to overthrow a government. The American Civil War falls between the two categories. The Union Army was converted into an army of liberation (Davis, 2006, p. 317), overthrowing a regime struggling for independence and based upon an opposed system of practices and ethics.

The war was truth-violence-sacred sanctified. A clergymen celebrated northern victory, arguing that Christian history “must feed itself on blood” and the United States now “may be said to have gotten a history.” Now “hallowed” by “rivers of blood”, the “Government is now become Providential” (Faust, 2008, p. 213). Apocalypse, linking violence, humanity and God, forged the Civil War narratives. Northerners cited “the sin of slavery as a religious justification for the use of violence”. The 1864 Christian Recorder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church concluded: “the goal of overturning the wrong of slavery made the conflict a righteous one and its carnage justifiable”. Black soldiers fought to “define and claim their humanity”, which for many was “inseparable from avenging the wrongs of a slave system that had rendered them property rather than men.” One explained: “To suppose that slavery, the accursed thing, could be abolished peacefully ... after having plundered cradles, separated husbands and wives, parents and children ... would be the greatest ignorance under the sun” (Faust, 2008, p. 50, 64, 70, 160).

A reconciliation ethic, however, pervaded Lincoln’s vision and handling of the Civil War. Lincoln, a “thorough fatalist”, “believed that what was to be would be, and no prayers of ours could arrest or reverse the decree.” No one “was responsible for what he was, thought, or did, because he was a child of conditions.” Utilitarian punishment should not be “an expression of hatred.” Lincoln often requested revised sentences for wartime criminals. In 1854, he contended that slave owners “were neither better, nor worse than we of the North”. Situated as they are, “we should act and feel as they do; and if they were situated as we are, they should act and feel as we do; and we never ought to lose sight of this fact in discussing the subject.” Lincoln projected the Civil War ending “with malice toward none; with charity for all” (Guelzo, 2009, p. 39-40). Lincoln’s ethics recast the Enlightenment heritage. The ethic of reconciliation spared post-Civil War America from the worst possible tragedies, as the North inflicted no radical vengeance upon the defeated. Most Confederate leaders and officers escaped execution. Nor did murderous slave retaliation occur, as in Haiti. This was the first modern information war, which could have deployed this new power to murderous ends. The 1860 United States was an information culture. War accelerated this, stimulating public demand for reliable knowledge about military and political matters,
and necessitating communication networks improvement. Photographers and print journalists recorded every imaginable fact of the conflict, revelations to “a knowledge-hungry public” (Finseth, 2006, p. 11).

It was a technological landmark in mass military violence. Mass mobilized armies broke 19th century convention: “the war generated a mass mobilization of common citizens and forces of unprecedented size”. These “three million ... were not trained professionals, schooled in drill and manoeuvre, but overwhelmingly volunteers with little military knowledge or experience”. Battle survivors shovelled corpses into pits “in bunches, just like dead chickens.” The pre-Civil War American ‘art of dying’ gave death transcendent meaning: “death is not to be regarded as a mere event in our history ... Death fixes our state.” (Faust, 2008, p. 16, 56, 23). Eternal ideals were subverted by armament innovations: “military technology equipped these mass armies with new, longer-range weapons” providing “dramatically increased firepower”. Railroads and industrial capacity facilitated army resupply and redeployment, “extending the duration of the war and the killing”. The 1862 Battle of Antietam confronted troops with twenty-three thousand dead or wounded men and horses scattered across battlefields. Numberless “non-combatants [also] perished as a direct result of the conflict” (Faust, 2008, p. 156, 76, 53, 89, 19). The Civil War experience forced every American’s humanity into question. Black Union Army soldiers constituted an existential destruction of the Confederate worldview (“our whole theory of slavery is wrong”). Atrocities upon black Yankees, from “slaughter of prisoners to mutilation of the dead”, the 1864 Fort Pillow massacre (nearly two-thirds of the three hundred black soldiers were massacred) attest thus. A Southern newspaper explained: “We cannot treat negroes ... as prisoners of war without a destruction of the social system for which we contend” (Faust, 2008, p. 61). Agents rather than victims of organized violence, African Americans destroyed a fragile secular edifice grounding a religiously sanctified hierarchy claiming eternal value.

Conclusion

The nation-state tradition holds revolution as a seizure of power to obtain the monopoly of violence. The North destroyed Confederate power, in a struggle where general loss of control over the military means of violence and population unrest had to be turned to Northern advantage. The new power formation, as envisaged by Lincoln, derived from the organizational impulses of populations. Counter-revolution, embodied in the Paris, Texas lynching of 1893, followed. Lincoln suppressed the political and cultural autonomy of the fragment, upholding universal equality grounded in the nation-state. Lincoln’s revolution, despite 1865 assassination in a Washington theatre, was a rapid acceleration of Northern industrial development combined with mass democracy. Cumulative colonial logic patterned this development drive (it was deadly for Native Americans). The mechanism of democracy also shaped the passage of the future. In time, the localized Southern regime crumbled with the Civil Rights Movement.
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