

# SOUTHERN SLAVERY, NORTHERN COMPLICITY

By Dan Sullivan, Pittsburgh, PA

(The following presentation was made at the Council of Georgist Organizations conference on Aug. 16, 2016 in Orlando, FL. It was transcribed from an audio recording by your GroundSwell editor.)



There are three forms of slavery. There are three factors of production: land, labor, and capital. And Georgists are fully aware that if you monopolize the land you monopolize labor because labor can't exist without land, and then, of course, chattel slavery is labor. In the Georgist definition, true capital is labor producing on land. So if you haven't monopolized the land, you haven't monopolized the labor, how do you monopolize the capital? The answer to that is by controlling the monetary system. If we had a land value tax, you would still have to have money to pay the land value tax. If all the money is loaned into circulation as opposed to being issued by government, then you end up with a system of debt slavery where you are coerced into paying your taxes with money that you are coerced into borrowing or getting from somebody else who was coerced into borrowing it. This concept that there are three forms of slavery runs throughout the debates prior to the Civil War and even prior to the Revolutionary War. Schalkenbach sells a book called *Riches, Real Estate and Resistance – How Land Speculation, Debt and Trade Monopolies Led to the American Revolution*. This theme exists throughout because those same factors led to the Civil War.

Slavery started with Portugal. And Portugal, Spain, France, all had people engaged in the African slave trade. Most of the slaves did not come here. Only 4% of the slaves that were shipped across the ocean were shipped to the Continental United States. Subsequent to that there were other slaves who were raised in the West Indies who were shipped from the West Indies to the United States. I don't have numbers on that but the actual number shipped from Africa trade was only 4% of those who were shipped to the United States.

Great Britain got into slavery in its war with Ireland. Their first slaves were Irish slaves. The original system of slavery was a prisoner of war system. When you won a war you captured your opponents and you enslaved them and at some point they could come into citizenship. With Ireland it kind of worked but after Cromwell's revolution, the entire country of Ireland was considered to be a country of enemies and slaves so an Irishman who remained Catholic was an enemy. This is from Margaret F. Sullivan from the 1880s, about the same time that Henry George was writing about Ireland, and she said the real Irish were not only counted as enemies and altogether outside the protection of the law. It was no capital offense to kill them and that is manifest by many records. Quoting an English official:

“An Englishman made the blunder of killing an Irishman who had become ‘loyal’. He pleaded in defence, when on trial, the law that his victim was ‘a mere Irishman,’ and therefore it was not a

crime to kill him. But it was proved that the Irishman was ‘loyal’, and the slayer was ‘recommitted to jail until he should find pledges to pay five marks to our lord the king for the value of said Irishman.’”

In other words, the crime wasn't killing the Irishman, the crime was destroying the king's property. If you make the Crown whole by paying the cost of killing one of their slaves then you are all right. Basically, if they did not become loyal after all their land was taken, they could be killed for any reason or no reason. But if they had sworn allegiance and subservience to the king, they were accepted as slaves.

“If the Irish did not become loyal after being driven off their lands, they could be lawfully killed; if they became loyal, they became in effect slaves to the Crown, and who so killed them had to pay the king for the destruction of his property.”

“Thousands, after being driven off their own land, were forced on shipboard, carried to Virginia and the West Indies, and sold as slaves. Six thousand were compelled to go to Sweden and fight for Gustavus Adolphus.”

So the first slaves brought here by the English were Irish. The Dutch had slaves. Cromwell decided they should get into the African slave trade. The English shipped the Irish slaves to Virginia and to places south of Virginia including the sugar plantations on the West Indies. They kept dying. Cromwell's argument was that Irish slaves die too quickly. And they cost too little. So the slave owners didn't mind working them to death because it was so cheap to get new ones, but the African slaves cost about ten times as much. So the slave owner would respect the slave as a valuable property if not as a human being and would work them less hard. So the overwhelming majority of slaves brought here were African slaves. But it began with Cromwell shipping Irish slaves over.

The revolution in England was partly because the previous king, James II, was Catholic and was really ruthless and oppressive. So what you have is an oppressive Catholic regime generating tremendous resentment and creating a more oppressive Protestant regime.

In the United States, getting back to the causes of slavery, under the Articles of Confederation all the money was issued directly; the Continental currency was issued directly. Another big mythology exists about that, which was that the Continental currency became worthless because our Government issued too many of them. Well, the state governments issued their own which was the problem. But the big problem was that the British government issued massive amounts of counterfeit Continentals. There were advertisements in the New York papers saying Continentals for the price of paper to any (continued on page 13)

## SOUTHERN SLAVERY (from page 2)

good loyal Englishman who wants them, so the British government was shipping over massive amounts of Continentals. They got to the point where they couldn't ship them fast enough so they set up printing presses in a ship that was stationed off shore, just outside of New York harbor. And they ran printing presses and they had other ships bringing them paper, and they had engravers, the best engravers England could get, which was the people that did their own currency. And apparently the way you could tell an English counterfeit Continental from the American Continental was that the American Continental had defects in it and the English Continental did not.

So one of the things that they did in the Constitution was they got rid of the direct issue of currency but said that we could borrow currency from banks. Now technically the wording is unclear as to whether the federal government could still issue paper currency directly. That has been argued about forever. But because it was unclear they didn't issue much currency at all until Lincoln did it. The bank issue of currency kept people perpetually in debt because you had to pay your taxes and conduct your affairs with borrowed currency. One of the things in this book that led to the Revolution was because we had what was called the Colonial Script. Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and several states issued their own money. It was called Bills of Credit. Those Bills of Credit paid for government and then you paid your taxes by returning those Bills of Credit to government at which time they were either reissued or destroyed. The Articles of Confederation called for Land Value Tax but it is doubted that more than a token amount of land value tax was ever collected. States were able to argue endlessly about what the land value was and they didn't have mechanisms to assess it and, once the Revolution was over, the political hierarchy was large landowners and they didn't want to have a mechanism to make that work.

So the Constitution, which was import tariffs and excise taxes, and sales taxes are very general excise taxes, but the first specific major excise tax was on whiskey. That caused the first rebellion, which was the whiskey rebellion, which was not actually just in Pittsburgh. The entire frontier used whiskey as a currency. Merchants were all alcoholics because you had to test the soundness of the currency by taking a taste. Washington -- this is the only time a President ever led troops against its own U.S. citizens -- in a great show marched troops to Bedford, PA, and the rest of the Army went to where the actual fighting was. They went to Pittsburgh and suppressed the Whiskey Rebellion in Pittsburgh and the larger city which at the time was Canonsburg to the south of it.

This set a stage because later when the Civil War came. Green County is in the southwest corner of Pennsylvania, and was a major station of the underground railroad for runaway slaves. Green County sided with the Confederacy and did not try to secede but declared for the Confederacy's right to secede. This is largely because they were still rankling 70 years later over the Whiskey Rebellion.

In general there was an antagonism between the industrial, financial, and commercial interests of the northeast and all of the agrarian areas which were the south and west. That created a major problem. The next thing that ties in indirectly is the

Alien and Sedition Acts. These were pushed by the Federalists who were the Northeastern industrialists, what the Socialists would call the Capitalist class, but they were worried because the Northeast was getting so many immigrants, and immigrants didn't like them. So it is very much like the Republican Party today, in that they want to do everything we can to discourage immigration. You could be a citizen after 5 years. You could be arrested or deported for a crime originally, but you could be arrested or deported if they deemed you to be dangerous or from a hostile country even if you had no crime. The part about being deemed dangerous was revealed under Jefferson, but the part about being from a hostile country was not. This was the justification for arresting and interning the Japanese and some Germans and Guantanamo Bay and it came out of the remnant of the Alien and Sedition Acts. The Sedition part was that criticizing the government was legal only if you could create a preponderance of evidence that was true. So it wasn't that you had to prove it beyond a reasonable doubt, but it wasn't that they had to prove it was false beyond a reasonable doubt either. A lot of supporters of the Jeffersonians, a lot of newspaper editors were jailed under this. This created such a backlash that they elected Jefferson.

Jefferson and Madison issued something called Nullification Papers. These were arguments that when the federal government exceeds its bounds in an unconstitutional way, Jefferson argued that the state could simply nullify it by refusing to follow the law. The Constitution was not clear on what the remedy was for unconstitutional acts. Madison said the states could interpose, which actually was a more delicate wording but was actually more provocative. It meant that if the federal government went to assess and collect a tariff on a merchant in your state, the state government could marshal forces to protect that merchant to prevent the federal government from collecting. So this sets precedent for a lot of things that happened, some of which had nothing to do with slavery, but happened before the Civil War.

The complaints of the South were the unauthorized disposal of public lands. There is nothing in the constitution giving the federal government the authority to dispose of public lands or to acquire territories. Jefferson got the Louisiana purchase because it was just too good of a deal to pass up. The assumption of state debts which was Hamilton's, most of the state debts were in the North. Mostly the Revolution was because the North had grievances, although the South went along with the Revolution. The Revolution began in Boston, and the South was saying, OK, we helped out in the Revolution, you incurred state debts, but your debts were to your citizens. The biggest debts were to Robert Morris who created credit out of thin air and loaned it to the people and then when the war was over they owed him to pay back all that money that he had conjured up out of thin air.

There were bounties to Northeastern fishermen. The federal government started paying Northeastern fishermen in proportion to their catch thinking they (continued on pg. 14)

## SOUTHERN SLAVERY (from page 13)

were subsidizing the fishing industry. The bounties to vessels engaged in foreign trade were indirect. If you wanted to trade between Europe and the United States you had to pay tariffs. But if your ship was a European made ship, your tariffs were higher. But if you did it on an American made ship your tariffs were lower. The American made ships were all made in New England. So the South was paying heavy tariffs partly to protect what they called infant industries in the North but mostly to protect the shipping industry which was very well established. It cost a lot more to build a good oak vessel in Europe than here because Europe had depleted its supplies of wood quite a long time ago, and we had a lot. We had no need for protection for ship building whatsoever. They granted a monopoly of coastal trade. That means a European ship could legally sail across to America and go to one city, drop off its cargo, and then if it went to another city, it was only to pick up cargo and take it back to Europe. A European ship could not legally pick up cargo in New York to transport it to Philadelphia or Richmond or Savannah or any other place.

Then the indirect values – the domestic manufacturers – was also tariffs. What they figured out, long before Henry George, was that the customer pays the tariff, and that the customer pays the tariff even if it is American goods. The European goods are sold at what would be free market plus the tariff. But the American goods are sold at what would be free market plus the value of the tariffs, and the American goods get an excess of profit. In that sense, the tariff was a direct subsidy to the manufacturer of the domestic product which were all Northern. Eighty percent of tariffs were paid by Southerners, and most of the money was spent in the North.

Funding territorial government at state expense was a land speculation issue. We sent railroads into the West at public expense to increase land values in the West. And most of those railroads were in the North. The reason industry was in the North was because the North had good water power. The northern streams flowed through the Appalachian mountains and down to the sea and it was very easy to have water mills in the north. The southern streams were much flatter and meandering and you really couldn't build up much. So the North had a natural advantage with industry already. The point here, though, is that while 80% of the tariffs were levied on southerners, about 80% of the revenue was spent in the North. So there was a massive transfer of wealth from the South to the North.

When people say that the war was about slavery, all these issues were about slavery. Every time a Southerner objected, the North said, "Well, you have free labor," so why are you objecting. We abolished our slavery, and you still have yours, and you still have free labor. We were looking at severing the Union at the very beginning. Washington wanted to retire after his first term. Jefferson wrote to Washington and said, "I can scarcely contemplate a more incaluable evil than the breaking of the union into two or more parts. Yet when we...consider that [opposition to the Constitution] lay chiefly in the Southern quarter, that...whenever Northern and Southern prejudices have come into conflict, the latter have been sacrificed and the former soothed; that the owners of the debt are in the Southern and the holders of it in the Northern division...that this has been brought about by the Monarchical federalists themselves...who can be sure that these things may not [lead to secession]? And this is

the event at which I tremble, and to prevent which I consider your continuance at the head of affairs to be of the last importance. The confidence of the whole union is centered in you...North and South will hang together, if they have you to hang on; and, if the first corrective of a numerous representation should fail in its effect, your presence will give time for trying others not inconsistent with the union and peace of the states." So here is Jefferson saying we must keep Washington in order to avoid a falling apart of the Union in 1792.

As far as the treatment of slaves, Jefferson wrote to William Short, "New York, for example, like London, seems to be a Cloacina" (*the Roman god of Streams, and as Rome developed she became known as the Roman god of sewers*) "of all the depravities of human nature." (*So he is saying that New York is becoming like London, kind of a sewer of depravity and corruption.*) "Philadelphia doubtless has it's share. Here on the contrary, crime is scarcely heard of, breaches of order rare" (*in Virginia*), "and our societies, if not refined, are rational moral and affectionate at least. Our only blot" (*slavery*) "is becoming less offensive by the great improvement in the condition and civilization of that race, who can now more advantageously compare their situation with that of the laborers of Europe." (*In other words, the American slaves were better off than the laborers of Europe. You can discount that because Jefferson was a slave owner.*)

When you look at how Europe was, the abolitionists of the South, William Lloyd Garrison, called for secession of the North. Garrison called for the North to secede from the South and for Ireland to secede from England, both for the same reason. The treatment of the peasants in Europe was generally worse than slaves are treated here. The most notorious example was probably the French nobleman whose feet were cold and who cut open the guts of a peasant so he could stick his feet in them to warm his feet on a dying peasant. The Droid de Seigneur was that a nobleman has the right, when a peasant gets married, to deflower the bride. There was a thing called Fardals which is that any peasant, no matter what he is doing, if a nobleman says I need you to do this, must drop what he is doing and do the nobleman's work for him.

Europe was a system of slavery, and probably the reason the French Revolution was the bloodiest, most vicious revolution of all was because the French nobles were the most brutal and insensitive to their peasants.

As far as abolitionists getting involved in this, this is from Uncle Tom's Cabin about the slavemaster Simon LaGree, who was from New England. This guy bought some slaves and treated them extremely cruelly because he thought he could work his slaves as hard as the immigrants in New England were being worked. And the immigrants in New England, of course, worked because if they lost their job they starved. But the Southern culture did not tolerate the level of cruelty that New Englanders presented. So Harriet Beecher Stowe who was an abolitionist, made her slavemaster a New Englander in order to show how cruel the New Englanders are. In the back of her 1852 book, (continued on page 15)

## SOUTHERN SLAVERY (from page 14)

she says,

"Do you say that the people of the free states have nothing to do with it, and can do nothing? Would to God this were true. But it is not true. The people of the free states have defended, encouraged, and participated; and are more guilty for it, before God, than the South, in that they have not the apology of education or custom. If the mothers of the free states had all felt as they should, in times past, the sons of the free states would not have been the holders, and, proverbially, the hardest masters of slaves; the sons of the free states would not have connived at the extension of slavery, in our national body; the sons of the free states would not, as they do, trade the souls and bodies of men as an equivalent to money, in their mercantile dealings. There are multitudes of slaves temporarily owned, and sold again, by merchants in northern cities; and shall the whole guilt or obloquy of slavery fall only on the South."

This is much better than Jefferson's quote, because this was a prominent abolitionist. William Lloyd Garrison came out hard against the war, and said there is all this war talk, that the North was itching for war, but the idea that the South really wanted to go to war to secede rather than that the North wanting to go to war to grind them down was kind of a historical reconstruction. They argued. Horace Greeley had the largest Republican paper of all and he was for the right of secession. The mayor of New York City, which had a lot of immigrants in it, when the South announced that it wanted to secede, announced that he wanted New York to join in the secession, and that if it wouldn't, he wanted New York City to secede from New York State. There was a great deal of rancor against these federalists from people who had nothing to do with slavery.

Greeley said, "If the Cotton States consider the value of the Union debatable, we maintain their perfect right to discuss it. Nay, we hold with Jefferson to the inalienable right of communities to alter or abolish forms of government that have become oppressive or injurious; and if the Cotton States shall become satisfied that they can do it better out of the union than in it, we insist on letting them go in peace. The right to secede may be a revolutionary one, but it exists nevertheless; and we do not see how one party can have a right to do what another party has a right to prevent."

He wrote several things like this. He also wrote an article (he was invited to join an anti-slavers society) and he said you are only against just one form of slavery practiced in the distant South. I am against all forms of slavery, including those in my own community and forms that are sometimes more brutal and more oppressive than the ones that you are against. So I cannot be against one form of slavery without being against all of them.

There are scathing editorials against keeping people in the Union. The Utica, New York Observer, the New York Express, the New York Herald, the New York Journal of Commerce, and the Bangor (Maine) Union argued for secession.

The New York Herald (that's Greeley again): "Each State is organized as a complete government, holding the purse and wielding the sword, possessing the right to break the tie of the confederation as a nation might break a treaty, and to repel coercion as a nation might repel invasion... Coercion, if it were possible is out of the question."

The Boston Post said, "An extra session of Congress should be called at once" – which Mr. Lincoln has refused to do – "and if that body prove incompetent to the duty required, than a National Convention should be convened; and, if all measures for a satisfactory adjustment fail, after full hearing and answers to statements of discontent,...let it (the South) depart in peace, if possible."

One of the last things that Greeley wrote was that we have no recourse if they want to secede in peace as long as they do not attack. And this was the key. Lincoln did not want to be the President for whom the Union fell apart. Lincoln was rapidly losing support in the North for resisting secession. But if the South did something violent, everybody would rally to him. It was kind of like the reaction to 9/11 because we were attacked.

Virginia had come to Lincoln while he was a nominee but not in office and said we don't want to secede and we think that Jefferson Davis is a hothead and will calm down and we can bog him down in negotiations and avoid secession, and everything will go on as usual. Lincoln, perhaps being swayed by the face to face argument agreed to three things, three principles to the Virginia delegation. One, he agreed that there is a right of secession. He agreed that though it might be a very complicated thing like divorce. Two, he agreed that if the South did secede that the forts in the South would be the property of the South. And the third one was that until negotiations were done, he would not attempt to send soldiers and build up his power in the Southern forts, that the Southern forts would have the same munitions and personnel that they have now and he would only provision them. In Lincoln's inaugural address he repudiated the first two. He repudiated that there is a right of secession; he repudiated that he said even if the South did secede, we will keep the forts. And so the Virginia delegation who had represented a conciliatory stance to all the other Confederate states felt doubly betrayed. And everybody else felt betrayed. And the third one, the provision of the forts, Lincoln sent an Armada steaming toward Fort Sumter. And the Southern representatives said we want to examine the contents of these ships. If you are just provisioning them we have no objection, but if you are building up reinforcements, we cannot allow that. He denied them the right to inspect the ships. That was his gambit. They had to trust him that he was not setting up an armada at Fort Sumter which would have given him easy access to conquer Charleston if they seceded. So the ships went without that, and they attacked Fort Sumter as the ships were heading toward Fort Sumpter.

And so the propaganda, Fort Sumter in Charleston, South Carolina, was a peaceful Union fort that was attacked by the Confederate Army in April 1861. The battle lasted two days. Well, it was a peaceful Union fort but an act of aggression, according to European historians, is sending reinforcements and mobilizing. It is like if we said to Cuba, we are just doing our little operation in Guantanamo Bay and we are sending large numbers of ships. You have to take our word for it that there aren't going to be 200,000 soldiers going to Guantanamo Bay. Well, that would (cont'd on page 16)

be considered an act of war against Cuba to put this massive army within striking distance of Cuba on their own soil. That is how the South reacted, and basically Lincoln said if I can bully them into attacking, then all this opposition in the North will evaporate. And that is what he did.