# Primary Sources for the Major Essay – Links to Approved Sources Outside of the Course

If you want to propose using primaries other than those provided in the Major Essays folder, email the links to your proposed primaries—or better email the links and call me during my office hours. Also, if you have an issue and you would like to have a primary source on it, email me. ***Caution:*** Do not begin working using that source until you have written confirmation from me that it is safe to use the primary source.

The first two columns probably make sense as is. The third column is a brief phrase that you can use (with a page number) to cite this source if you have not already had an English course that taught you a formal method.

You must compare an issue about two periods of time; therefore, you need at least one primary source from each of these time periods.
- 1600s through 1763

- 1763 through the 1830s

<http://www.cjbibus.com/1302_PossibleEssayQuestions_Unit1_DL.htm>

1875: Civil Rights Act of 1875 (Brief Term for Citation)

1895: B.T. Washington (Brief Term for Citation)

1896: Plessy-Harlan (Brief Term for Citation)

1898: I.W. Barnett-Letter to McKinley (Brief Term for Citation)

1899: I.W. Barnett-Lynch Law (Brief Term for Citation)

1909: NAACP (Brief Term for Citation)

1941: Exec. Order 8802 (Brief Term for Citation)

1938: M.M. Bethune (Brief Term for Citation)

1900: Senator Tillman (Brief Term for Citation)

1909: (Brief Term for Citation)

1909: (Brief Term for Citation)

1909: (Brief Term for Citation)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date**  | **Document Title and Link** | **Brief Term for Citation** |
| 1863 | Emancipation Proclamation (1863)<http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=34>  | Emancipation Proclamation |
| 1875 | Civil Rights Act of 1875<http://www.pbs.org/wnet/supremecourt/antebellum/sources_document7.html> The website PBS is the Public Broadcasting System. | Civil Rights Act of 1875 |
| 1895 | Address of Booker T. Washington, principal of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama, delivered at the opening of the Cotton States and International Exposition, at Atlanta, Ga., September 18, 1895 : with a letter of congratulation from the president of the United States.The website LOC.gov is the Library of Congress.<http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/murray:@field(DOCID+@lit(lcrbmrpt0c15div4))>  | B.T. Washington |
| 1896 | *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896) – Judge Harlan's dissentThe website CHNM is Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media.<http://chnm.gmu.edu/courses/nclc375/harlan.html>  | Plessy-Harlan |
| 1899 | Ida B. Well's pamphlet "Lynch Law in Georgia," 1899. The website PBS is the Public Broadcasting System.<http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/historical_docs/hist_doc_lynchlawinga1.html> This link does does not count as a primary source, but it does provide background on her: <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/stories_people_wells.html>  | I.W. Barnett-Lynch Law |
|  |  |  |
| 1900 | “Their Own Hotheadedness”: Senator Benjamin R.“Pitchfork Ben” Tillman Justifies Violence Against Southern Blacks. Notice where this speech was given.The website was created by the American Social History Project / Center for Media and Learning (Graduate Center, CUNY) and the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media (George Mason University). <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/55/> In this March 23, 1900, speech before the U.S. Senate, Senator Benjamin R. “Pitchfork Ben” Tillman of South Carolina defended the actions of his white constituents who had murdered several black citizens of his home state. Tillman blamed the violence on the “hot-headedness” of Southern blacks and on the misguided efforts of Republicans during the Reconstruction era after the Civil War to “put white necks under black heels.” He also defended violence against black men, claiming that southern whites “will not submit to [the black man] gratifying his lust on our wives and daughters without lynching him”—an evocation of the deeply sexualized racist fantasies of many Southern whites.  | Senator Tillman |
| 1898 | Killing the Messenger: Ida Wells-Barnett Protests a Postmaster’s Murder in 1898The website was created by the American Social History Project / Center for Media and Learning (Graduate Center, CUNY) and the Roy Rosenzweig Center for History and New Media (George Mason University). http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/56 | I.W. Barnett-Letter to McKinley |
| 1909 | Platform Adopted by Those Who Helped Found the NAACP, 1909.The website PBS is the Public Broadcasting System.<http://www.pbs.org/wnet/jimcrow/historical_docs/hist_doc_naacpfounding.html>  | NAACP |
|  | <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/executive_orders.php?year=1912&Submit=DISPLAY>  |  |
|  | <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/highwayhistory/road/s09.cfm>  |  |
|  | <http://negroartist.com/writings/MARY%20MCLEOD%20BETHUNE.htm>  |  |
|  | <http://negroartist.com/writings/Clarifying%20Our%20Vision%20with%20the%20Facts.pdf>  |  |
|  | <http://negroartist.com/>  |  |
|  | <http://www.amistadresearchcenter.org/archon/?p=collections/findingaid&id=13&q=&rootcontentid=5275>  |  |
| 1938 | Clarifying Our Vision with the Facts, Mary McLeod Bethune , *The Journal of Negro History*, Vol. 23, No. 1. (Jan., 1938), pp. 10-15. Bethune was the National Youth Adminstration’s Office of Negro Affairs.This website I do not know personally, but I will try to check it out further.<http://negroartist.com/writings/Clarifying%20Our%20Vision%20with%20the%20Facts.pdf>  | M.M. Bethune |
| 1941 | Executive Order 8802: Prohibition of Discrimination in the Defense Industry (1941)To see the document in a larger image, click on it as the instructions on screen tell you.The website ourdocuments.gov provides documents from the National Archives. <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=72>  | Exec. Order 8802 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | <http://dbs.ohiohistory.org/africanam/page1.cfm?ItemID=1618> –stange piece on dubois and ohio |  |
|  | <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/supremecourt/antebellum/sources.html> cases in 1st 100 years |  |
|  | <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/supremecourt/antebellum/landmark_plessy.html> not the doc |  |

Reminder: You may also use the Constitution as a primary source.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Date**  | **Document Title and Link** | **Brief Term for Citation** |
| 1660  | Slavery and Indentured Servants - It is a secondary course but it includes quotations from the law from 1660 through 1850. ***Caution:*** Do not use the sections on laws after 1840.<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/awhhtml/awlaw3/slavery.html>  | Laws-Servitude |
| 1780 | Pennsylvania - An Act for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery, 1780<http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/pennst01.asp> | PA-Abolition |
| 1787 | Northwest Ordinance; July 13, 1787 <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/nworder.asp>  | NW-Ordinance |
| 1807 | An Act to Prohibit the Importation of Slaves into any Port or Place Within the Jurisdiction of the United States, From and After the First Day of January, in the Year of our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Eight<http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/sl004.asp>  | End-Slave Trade |
|  | Home page for this<http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/Missouri.html>  |  |
|  | The Senate version of the bill denying slavery in the Louisiana Territory except for admitting Missouri as a slave state http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=035/llac035.db&recNum=211 |  |
|  | <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=147> 1571 72 |  |
|  | The House voted 90 to 87 to allow slavery in Missouri <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=154>  |  |
|  | en voted [134 to 42 to prohibit slavery in the Louisiana Territory](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=155) north of the 36° 30´ latitude line. http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=155379 380 senate debate on constitution |  |
|  | 379 380 senate debate on constitutionhttp://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=035/llac035.db&recNum=187 |  |
|  | Missouri compromise has few words from Tallmadge but not full text advertized<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/aia/part3/3h511t.html> |  |
|  | <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/mjmtext:@field%28DOCID+@lit%28jm090009%29%29#N0025-01> james Madison on the constitution on this  |  |
|  | <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field%28DOCID+@lit%28llac/035/01820367.tif%29%29>individual dates of the senate |  |
|  | <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=155> no slavery language in the missourin comp but not sure |  |
|  | <http://www.loc.gov/rr/program/bib/ourdocs/Missouri.html#American>  |  |
| 1831 | THE CONFESSIONS OF NAT TURNER,THE LEADER OF THE LATE INSURRECTION IN SOUTHAMPTON, VA.<http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/turner/turner.html> | Nat Turner |
| 1841 | Argument of John Quincy Adams, Before the Supreme Court of the United States : in the Case of the United States, Appellants, vs. Cinque, and Others, Africans, Captured in the schooner Amistad, by Lieut. Gedney; 1841 ***Note:*** This is later source than the 1830s, but as an ex-President and as a case that some of you may know, you may use it. <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/amistad_002.asp> | Adams-*Amistad* |
|  | <https://archive.org/details/speechofhonjames00tall>**n. James Tallmadge, of Duchess County, New York, in the House of Representatives of the United States, on slavery (1849)** |  |
|  | This amendment was submitted on February 13, 1819, by [James Tallmadge, Jr.](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Tallmadge%2C_Jr.), a Democratic-Republican from New York. Wiki crud says |  |
|  | [Slaves and the Courts, 1740-1860 - For Teachers (Library of Congress)](http://search.loc.gov:8765/cs.html?charset=utf-8&url=http%3A//www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/connections/slaves-court/history.html&qt=tallmadge+amendment+to+missouri+compromise&col=loc&n=7&la=en) This creative resource for teachers provides information about the American Memory collection, Slaves and the Courts, 1740-1860, and ideas to help students develop critical thinking skills through use of primary sources **...** <http://www.loc.gov/teachers/classroommaterials/connections/slaves->court/history.html  |  |
|  | <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?hlaw:26:./temp/~ammem_opJC>:: feb 13 1819 |  |

Reminder: You may also use the Constitution as a primary source.

[The Senate debated](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/hlaw:@field(DOCID+@lit(llac/035/01820367.tif))) the admission of Maine and Missouri from February 8 through February 17, 1820. On February 16, the Senate agreed to [unite the Maine and Missouri bills](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=035/llac035.db&recNum=209) into one bill. The following day the Senate agreed to an amendment that [prohibited slavery in the Louisiana Territory](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=035/llac035.db&recNum=211) north of the 36° 30´ latitude line, except for Missouri, and then agreed to the final version of the bill by a vote of 24 to 20. After rejecting the Senate's version of the bill, the [House of Representatives passed a bill](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=147) on March 1, that admitted Missouri without slavery. On March 2, after a House-Senate conference agreed to the Senate's version, the [House voted 90 to 87 to allow slavery in Missouri](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=154) and then voted [134 to 42 to prohibit slavery in the Louisiana Territory](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=155) north of the 36° 30´ latitude line.

The Senate debated the admission of Maine and Missouri from February 8 through February 17, 1820. On February 16, the Senate agreed to unite the Maine and Missouri bills into one bill. The following day the Senate agreed to an amendment that prohibited slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of the 36° 30´ latitude line, except for Missouri, and then agreed to the final version of the bill by a vote of 24 to 20. After rejecting the Senate's version of the bill, the [House of Representatives passed a bill](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=147) on March 1, that admitted Missouri without slavery. On March 2, after a House-Senate conference agreed to the Senate's version, the [House voted 90 to 87 to allow slavery in Missouri](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=154) and then voted [134 to 42 to prohibit slavery in the Louisiana Territory](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llac&fileName=036/llac036.db&recNum=155) north of the 36° 30´ latitude line.

In the two links that follow notice both the quantity of votes and which states voted which way on the issue:

* on allowing slavery in Missouri
* on prohibiting slavery in the Louisiana Territory above 36° 30´

Main site <http://lehrmaninstitute.org/history/missouri-compromise.asp>

**Thomas Jefferson’s Reaction** [**http://lehrmaninstitute.org/history/missouri-compromise.asp#Jefferson**](http://lehrmaninstitute.org/history/missouri-compromise.asp#Jefferson)

The Missouri Compromise re-engaged the political energies of the surviving Founders. New York’s Rufus King was one of the few still to be active in Washington. Historian Don E. Fehrenbacher noted: “Outside of Congress, John Jay, also a northern Founding Father of renown, offered an ingenious constitutional argument. Focusing on Article I, Section 9, paragraph 1, relating to Congress’s power to restrict the importation of slaves after 1808, he claimed that Congress could ban the importation of slaves into the state of Missouri specifically.”148 In subsequent years, however, most historians’ attention focused on the reaction of Thomas Jefferson, whose attitudes toward slavery had always been ambiguous and contradictory. The Missouri Compromise revealed the depth of those contradictions. Fehrenbacher observed: “The strongest opposition to the 36° 30' restriction came from the state of Virginia. Both Virginia senators voted against it, and, in the House of Representatives, eighteen Virginians contributed almost half of all the negative votes. They received emphatic moral support from the two greatest living Virginians. Thomas Jefferson had virtually invented the idea of prohibiting slavery in the American West, but now, thirty-six years later, he opposed the restrictive portion of the Compromise, adducing the ‘diffusion’ argument that the expansion of slavery would ameliorate the condition of the slave.”149

Historian Garry Wills wrote that after passage of the Missouri Compromise restricting slavery, “Jefferson, in great agitation, denied that Congress had or could have any such power: ‘To Regulate the condition of the different descriptions of men composing a state...is certainly the exclusive right of every state, which nothing in the Constitution has taken from then and given to the general government.’ If Congress has no right to exclude slavery in any place where the inhabitants desire it, why did he say it had that right in 1784, when he drafted his Ordinance. Apologists for Jefferson have puzzled over this matter for years.”150 To former President Jefferson, the Missouri Compromise was an anathema and a political trick by old Federalists. Jefferson’s concept of the nation was under attack. Samuel Eliot Morison, Henry Steele Commager and William E. Leuchtenburg wrote: “Surviving Federalist politicians and Middle-State Republicans saw an opportunity to create a solid North; to ‘snatch the sceptre from Virginia for ever,’ as H. G. Otis said. ‘Federalism, wrote the aged Jefferson, ‘devised this decoy to draw off the weak and wicked from the Republican ranks....The East is replaced in the saddle of government, and the Middle States are to be the cattle yoked to their cart.’” The authors wrote: “When Congress again took up the question, in January 1820, enough Northern Republicans were detached from the anti-slavery bloc by fear of a Federalist renaissance, to get a compromise measure through.”151

Historian Joseph J Ellis wrote: “Missouri made the long-standing paradox of slavery that he had been living so deftly into an undeniable contradiction. He had all along been living a lie.”152 Missouri demonstrated the inherent contradictions of Jefferson’s beliefs and actions. Ellis wrote: “Or, in the same vein: ‘On the subject of emancipation I have ceased to think because [it is] not to be the work of my day.’ In terms of his legacy, and within the context of the silent sectional agreement shared by the leadership of the revolutionary generation, now passing away, this constituted a confession of failure. The enlightened southern branch of the revolutionary generation, which Jefferson unequivocally headed, had not kept its promise. The Missouri crisis made that unpalatable fact more obvious than ever before and made it more difficult, even for Jefferson, to avoid it unattractive implications.”153

In April 1820, Jefferson wrote of the Missouri Compromise: “This momentous question, like a fire bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the knell of the Union. It is hushed, indeed, for the moment. But this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence.”154 Historian Darren Staloff wrote: “In Jefferson’s view, the real object of opponents to Missouri’s admission as a slave state was power, pure and simple....In fact, the whole issue smacked of a sectional power grab by the northern states, a mere ‘trick of hypocrisy.’” 155 In late December, Jefferson wrote his former secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin of the dispersion of slavery: “The Federalists, completely put down and despairing of ever rising again under the old divisions of Whig and Tory, devised a new one of slave-holding and non-slave-holding States, which, while it had a semblance of being moral, as at the same time geographical, and calculated to give them ascendency....Moral the question certainly is not, because the removal of slaves from one State to another, no more than their removal from one country to another, would never make a slave of one human being who would not be so without it. Indeed, if there were any morality in the question it is on the other side; because by spreading them over a larger surface their happiness would be increased, and burden of their future liberation lightened by bringing a greater number of shoulders under it. However, it served to throw dust into the eyes of the people and to fanaticize them, while to the knowing ones it gave a geographical and preponderant line of the Potomac and Ohio, throwing fourteen States to the North and East, and ten to the South and West. With these, therefore, it is merely a question of power; but with this geographical minority it is a question of existence. For if Congress once goes out of the Constitution to arrogate a right of regulating the condition of the inhabitants of the States, its majority may, and probably will, next declare that the condition of all men within the Untied States shall be that of freedom; in which case all the whites south of the Potomac and Ohio must evacuate their States, and most fortunate those who can do it first.” 156

On February 7, 1820, President Monroe had written Jefferson: “The Missouri question, absorbs by its importance, & the excit'ment it has produc'd, every other & there is little prospect, from present appearances of its being soon settled. The object of those, who brought it forward, was undoubtedly to acquire power, & the expedient well adapted to the end, as it enlisted in their service, the best feelings, of all that portion of our Union, in which slavery does not exist, & who are unacquainted with the condition of their Southern brethren. The same men, in some instances, who were parties to the project in 1786, for closing the mouth of the Mississippi for 25 years, may be consider'd as the Authors of this. The dismemberment of the Union by the Allegheny Mountains, was then believ'd to be their object; and altho' a new arrangement of powers, is more particularly sought on this occasion, yet it is believ'd, that the anticipation, of even that result, would not deter its Authors from the pursuit of it. I am satisfied that the bond of Union, is too strong for them, and that the better their views are understood, throughout the whole Union, the more certain will be their defeat in every part. It requires, however, great moderation, firmness, & wisdom, on the part of those opposed to the restriction, to secure a just result. These great & good qualities, will I trust, not be wanting.”157

Jefferson wrote Congressman John Homes in April: “A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper. I can say, with conscious truth, that there is not a man on earth who would sacrifice more than I would to relieve us from this heavy reproach, in any practicable way. The cession of that kind of property, for so it is misnamed, is a bagatelle which would not cost me a second thought, if, in that way, a general emancipation and expatriation could be effected; and, gradually, and with due sacrifices, I think it might be. But as it is, we have the wolf by the ears, and we can neither hold him, nor safely let him go. Justice is in one scale, and self-preservation in the other. Of one thing I am certain, that as the passage of slaves from one State to another, would not make a slave of a single human being who would not be so without it, so their diffusion over a greater surface would make them individually happier, and proportionally facilitate the accomplishment of their emancipation, by dividing the burthen on a greater number of coadjutors. An abstinence too, from this act of power, would remove the jealousy excited by the undertaking of Congress to regulate the condition of the different descriptions of men composing a State. This certainly is the exclusive right of every State, which nothing in the constitution has taken from them and given to the General Government. Could Congress, for example, say, that the non-freemen of Connecticut shall be freemen, or that they shall not emigrate into any other State?”

I regret that I am now to die in the belief, that the useless sacrifice of themselves by the generation of 1776, to acquire self-government and happiness to their country, is to be thrown away by the unwise and unworthy passions of their sons, and that my only consolation is to be, that I live not to weep over it. If they would but dispassionately weigh the blessings they will throw away, against an abstract principle more likely to be effected by union than by scission, they would pause before they would perpetrate this act of suicide on themselves, and of treason against the hopes of the world. To yourself, as the faithful advocate of the Union, I tender the offering of my high esteem and respect.158

It was not Jefferson’s style to get involved in contentious national issues when out of office. He did not like to be involved personally in controversy; he preferred others to do that work. Historian Roger G. Kennedy wrote: “Jefferson, still very much a force in the nation, might have influenced these narrow outcomes but chose not to do so. In fact, he used his influence on the side of the plantation owners, giving as his reason an abhorrence of the prospect of Congress drawing boundaries for slavery. He communicated that severe view to President James Monroe, who may have been a little surprised; as noted earlier, Monroe had been beside Jefferson...during the debates over limiting slavery in 1784, when Jefferson had taken the opposite view. Then, Merrill Peterson assures us, ‘slavery had become in his [Jefferson’s] mind a matter of fundamental national importance overriding questions of local autonomy.’ Then he had supported congressional action to decree ‘that after the year 1800...there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said states, otherwise than punishment for crimes, whereof the party shall have been convicted to have been personally guilty.’”159 Historian Alf J. Mapp, Jr., noted: “In February, the month in which a Missouri Compromise was attained under Henry Clay’s leadership, Jefferson wrote about slavery in his memoirs. The compromise did nothing to lessen his anxiety because, as he wrote Spencer Roane, the agreement had merely ‘smeared over’ the central issue. So Jefferson, in his memoirs, wrote of American blacks: ‘Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free. Nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion has drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation peaceably and in such slow degree as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place be part pass filled up by free white laborers. If on the contrary it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up.’” 160

Jefferson might think emancipation inevitable, but he opposed the very means to prevent slavery’s extension. Historian Garry Wills wrote that after passage of the Missouri Compromise, “Jefferson, in great agitation, denied that Congress had or could have any such power.”161 In a letter to John Holmes on April 20, 1820, Jefferson wrote: “I had for a long time ceased to read the newspapers or pay any attention to public affairs, confident they were in good hands, and content to be a passenger in our bark to the shore from which I am not distant. but this momentous question, like a fire bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the knell of the Union. it is hushed indeed for the moment. but this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. a geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once concieved [sic] and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper. I can say with conscious truth that there is not a man on earth who would sacrifice more than I would, to relieve us from this heavy reproach, in any practicable way, the cession of that kind of property, for so it is misnamed, is a bagatelle which would not cost me in a second thought, if, in that way, a general emancipation and expatriation could be effected: and, gradually, and with due sacrifices, I think it might be. but, as it is, we have the wolf by the ear, and we can neither hold him, nor safely let him go. Justice is in one scale, and self-preservation in the other. Of one thing I am certain, that as the passage of slaves from one state to another would not make a slave of a single human being who would not be so without it, so their diffusion over a greater surface would make them individually happier and proportionally facilitate the accomplishment of their emancipation, by dividing the burthen on a greater number of co-adjutors an abstinence too from this act of power would remove the jealousy excited by the undertaking of Congress, to regulate the condition of the different descriptions of men composing a state. this certainly is the exclusive right of every state, which nothing in the constitution has taken from them and given to the general government. could congress, for example say that the Non-freemen of Connecticut, shall be freemen, or that they shall not emigrate into any other state?”162

The threat that Jefferson perceived and feared was not just concerning slavery, but the ghosts of Federalists who had fallen into a shrinking political minority two decades earlier. The former president had a well-developed sensibility to lurking demons. Historian Roger G. Kennedy wrote: “What was the evil he had in mind, we may ask? Was it slavery? If so, why had he done nothing to prevent its spread since 1784? Perhaps the evil he imagined was the presence of people of color, whether slave or free. As noted in earlier pages, Jefferson could not accept the concept of a multiracial society wherein free people of color would coexist with free people of his complexion; he did not share the high opinion of free blacks asserted by ‘noisy pretenders to exclusive humanity.’”163 Kevin R. C. Gutzman wrote: “Jefferson’s devotion to the idea of colonizing as many American blacks as possible died only when he did....As Jefferson claimed to understand the matter, extension of the South’s peculiar institution would not increase the number of people held in slavery by even one, so the supposed moral issue involved in the campaign to keep slavery out of Missouri must be a mask for some other motive. He had no difficulty arriving at the conclusion that what lay at the root of anti-Missouri agitation was an attempt by Northern crypto-Federalists to resuscitate their moribund party. This they could achieve, Jefferson argued, by drawing a geographic line between the (minority) slaveholding section and the (majority) free section of the country. The Missouri Crisis was all about Federalist electoral machinations!” 164

Former President James Madison was also upset by the Thomas Amendment. Madison shared Jefferson’s preoccupation with Rufus King an a crypto-Federalist plot to undermine the Constitution. “It was perhaps predictable that Madison, like Jefferson, Taylor, and other elderly Republican figures, espied a Federalist plot behind the Missouri Crisis,” wrote Madison biographer Kevin R. Gutzman. “King’s prominent role in the anti-Missouri- leadership gave this hypothesis great weight, as King had been the Federalist presidential nominee in both 1812 and 1816.”165 Madison wrote Monroe: “The inflammatory conduct of Mr. King surprises every one. His general warfare agst. the slave-holding States, and his efforts to disparage the securities derived from the Const. were least of all to be looked for.”166 Madison wrote President Monroe on February 10 about its political implications: “I find the idea is fast spreading, that the zeal with which the extension (so called) of slavery is opposed, has, with the coalesced leaders, an object very different from the welfare of slaves, or the check to their increase; and that the real object is, as you intimate, to form a new state of parties founded on local instead of political distinctions; thereby dividing the Republicans of the North from those of the South, and making the former instrumental in giving the opponents of both an ascendancy over the whole. If this be the view of the subject at Washington, it furnishes an additional reason for a conciliatory proceeding in relation to Maine.”167 Ever the political theorist, Madison again wrote James Monroe nearly two weeks later: “As to the right of Congress to apply such a restriction during the territorial period, it depends on the clause specially providing for the management of those subordinate establishments.

On one side it naturally occurs, that the right, being given from the necessity of the case, and in suspension of the great principle of self-government, ought not to be extended further, nor continued longer, than the occasion might fairly require. On the other side, it cannot be denied that the constitutional phrase ‘to make all rules,’ &c., as expounded by uniform practice, is somewhat of a ductile nature, and leaves much to legislative discretion. 168

The Missouri controversy pushed together the disparate sections of the South into a more cohesive block. Historian George Dangerfield wrote: “In a sense, the Tallmadge Amendment, with its train of town-meetings, pamphlets, editorials, and debates summoned the South into being. No man could have said in 1819 what ‘the South’ was; still less could one have spoken of a typical Southerner. Those who dwelt south of the Mason-Dixon line might have been said to have, perhaps, a kind of climatic fellowship.” 169 Cotton had changed the economy of the Louisiana Purchase and was undermining the Jeffersonian ideal of a nation of yeoman farmers. Historian Roger G. Kennedy wrote: “The slave population of the Spanish possessions in the Mississippi Valley was confined within the immediate neighborhood of New Orleans and a few plantations along the Mississippi. There was very little agricultural servitude in the villages upriver. Had these enclaves been allowed to shrivel further, the valley might have been organized into free territories instead of slave territories.”170 It was not to be.

The Missouri Compromise would become Abraham Lincoln’s touchstone in his fight against the extension of slavery in 1854 after passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Historian Robert Pierce Forbes wrote: "Lincoln's approach to the question of slavery was carefully circumscribed. Initially, in fact, he stood aloof from the new Republican organization, until convinced that it would eschew abolitionism. Although he claimed to hate slavery as much as the abolitionists, Lincoln's approach to combating it consisted, almost entirely, in restricting it to the boundaries prescribed by the Missouri Compromise. In part, this circumspection reflected Lincoln's understanding of the constitutional limits to interference with slavery; but it was also true that he was confident that to limit slavery's expansion was to condemn it to extinction.”171 Eventually, the conflict over slavery’s expansion would lead to slavery’s demise.
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