

# THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR: A HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

\*\*\*

Two major historiographical arguments, or schools of thought, must be considered when American Civil War (1861-1865) historiography is reviewed. Historians, when it comes to contemplating these two schools, can be categorized either as fundamentalist or revisionist. These are two dominant themes that have consistently been perceived by researchers.<sup>1</sup> Historians who viewed that the war was inevitable are referred to as fundamentalists. They viewed the clash between the North and the South as inevitable, unavoidable, or irrepressible. These historians, like Henry Wilson and James Ford Rhodes who authored key works, believed that slavery was the source of the conflict. Many fundamentalist historians believed that culture, economics, and ideological sectional differences were “irreconcilable.”<sup>2</sup> Other historians, who have a differing interpretation as compared to the fundamentalists, can be grouped into a revisionist camp. The revisionists, such as Frank L. Owsley and James G. Randall who also developed key works, thought slavery was not central to the conflict but peripheral. Revisionist historians strongly argued for economic, political, and social reasons for the sectional crisis. Revisionist also believed that inept politicians purposefully avoided an amicable resolution or that “the impending war had been exacerbated and would [later] subside.”<sup>3</sup> In addition to these two major schools of thought, Civil War historians can also be associated with other nondominant views, such as economics, politics, and social ideologies; “natural limits” theories; or micro-historical focused works (alternatively called microhistories).

The histories that should be given primary consideration are by first-generation historians. These histories are first-hand accounts from those who saw and/or participated in the conflict. The idea that the American Civil War was inevitable can be traced back to a speech that was delivered by then New York Senator William H. Seward. He would later serve as Secretary of State for the Lincoln administration. In “The Irrepressible Conflict” (1858), he proclaimed: “It is an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces, and will, sooner or later, become either entirely a slave holding nation, or entirely a free-labor nation.”<sup>4</sup> And, thus, the idea was born, even before the war commenced. The idea that the war was an “irrepressible conflict” became a major theme that would recur again and again in many historical works.

Several years after the speech of Seward, Alexander Stephens, Vice President of the Confederate States, attributed the causation to slavery. In a speech presented in Georgia, “Speech of Hon. A.H. Stephens” (1861), Stephens is quoted as saying “This was the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution ... Our new government[‘s] ... foundations are laid, its corner stone rests upon the great truth that the negro is not equal to the white man—that slavery,

---

<sup>1</sup> Kenneth S. Greenberg, “Civil War Revisionism,” *Reviews in American History* 7, no. 2 (June 1979): 202. Greenberg says, “The conflict between fundamentalist and revisionist students of Civil War causation—between those who see slavery as central to sectional conflict and those who see it as peripheral—has a long and acrimonious history.”

<sup>2</sup> Michael Schearer, “Historiography of the Causes of the Civil War” (Liberty University, 2020), 2, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3714025>.

<sup>3</sup> Brandon M. Eldridge, “The Ever-Evolving Historiography of the American Civil War,” *Graduate Review* 1, no. 1 (2021): 56.

<sup>4</sup> William H. Seward. “The Irrepressible Conflict: A Speech by William H. Seward, Delivered at Rochester, Monday, Oct. 25, 1858,” In *The Campaign of 1860* (Albany: Weed, Parsons & Company, 1860), 2.

subordination to the superior race is his natural and moral condition.”<sup>5</sup> This speech was given a few weeks before volleys were fired onto Fort Sumter. Near the end of the war, the President of the United States Abraham Lincoln presented in his “Second Inaugural Address” (1865) that “slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was, somehow, the cause of the war.”<sup>6</sup> So here, two leaders, who from the highest levels of opposing governments, agreed that slavery was the root cause of the American Civil War.

James Buchanan, Edward A. Pollard, and Henry Wilson are other notable examples of first-generation historians. In Buchanan’s book, *The Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion: A History of Four Years Before the War* (1865), it shows that “all our future troubles are to be found in the long, active, and persistent hostility of Northern abolitionists, both in and out of congress, against Southern slavery, until the final triumph of their cause in the election of President Lincoln.”<sup>7</sup> Ex-president James Buchanan was a defender of the “peculiar institution,” and, clearly, this shows in his work that was published during, or shortly after, the war. In Edward A. Pollard’s *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates* (1866), he argued that state sovereignty was the reason for secession. In that work, Pollard stated when “the government at Washington drew the sword against the sovereignty of states and insisted on the right of coercion, it was then that Virginia appreciated the change of issue, and, to contest it found it necessary to withdraw from the Union.”<sup>8</sup> Pollard, who supported the South, was a newspaper editor during the war. And lastly is Henry Wilson who was a Massachusetts Senator during the conflict and staunch opponent of slavery. His multi-volume work, *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America* (1872), attempts to impartially, according to him, render the history of slavery and the conflict. Wilson, who worked closely with the Lincoln administration, re-emphasized Seward’s noteworthy phrase—the “irrepressible conflict.” He stated that “I have striven with scrupulous fidelity to truth and justice to narrate the facts ... and portray the results of this ‘irrepressible conflict’ between the antagonistic forces of freedom and slavery.”<sup>9</sup> Wilson’s claim that slavery was central to the war is considered to be an “early foundation for the fundamentalist.”<sup>10</sup>

James Ford Rhodes is a second-generation Civil War historian and came to prominence in the early 20th century. He is considered to be a part of a significant historiographical evolution and generational shift from first-generation historians. Rhodes is associated with the “moral” school of thought and is regarded as a fundamentalist. His position states that the conflict was inevitable, and slavery was the main reason that made war unavoidable. Rhodes, to support his claim, is known to have “lauded abolitionists and dismissed states’ rights constitutionalism,”<sup>11</sup> which were views that were unlike that of Southern partisans who came before him. In support of his

---

<sup>5</sup> “Speech of Hon. A.H. Stephens,” *Southern Confederacy* (GA), March 25, 1861, Newspapers.com.

<sup>6</sup> Abraham Lincoln, *Little Masterpieces* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1903), 104.

<sup>7</sup> James Buchanan, *The Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion: A History of Four Years Before the War* (London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston, 1865), iv.

<sup>8</sup> Edward A. Pollard, *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates* (New York: E.B. Treat & Co., 1866), 121.

<sup>9</sup> Henry Wilson. *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America*, vol. 1 (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1872), vi.

<sup>10</sup> Scheerer, 5.

<sup>11</sup> Frank Towers, “Partisans, New History, and Modernization: The Historiography of the Civil War’s Causes, 1861-2011,” *Journal of the Civil War Era* 1, no. 2 (June 2011): 242, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26070115>.

interpretation, Rhodes wrote in his *History of the Civil War, 1861-1865* (1917) that “The great factor in the destruction of slavery was the election of Abraham Lincoln as President in 1860 by the Republican party, who had declared against the extension of slavery into the territories.”<sup>12</sup> To re-emphasize, Rhodes believed that slavery was the root cause, and the “uncompromisable moral issue” made war unavoidable.

Progressive Era historians, who came to prominence in the early 20th century, developed innovative perspectives on American history. When it came to the Civil War, a new radical interpretation emerged and was based upon economic and social interests rather than centering on slavery.<sup>13</sup> Charles A. Beard was a Progressive Era historian and was known for his most influential work, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (1913). This work claimed that the U.S. Constitution was implemented to safeguard the rights and interests of the wealthy and upper elites. He had fundamentalist views but also emphasized the economic and social causes of the war. Beard, along with his wife Mary, authored a two-volume work called *The Rise of American Civilization* (1927 and 1928). In the work, the Beards characterized the Civil War as “The Second American Revolution.”<sup>14</sup> They insisted in this revolution that,

At the bottom [of the classes] was a social war, ending in the unquestioned establishment of a new power in the government, making vast changes in the arrangement of classes, in the accumulation of distribution of wealth, in the course of industrial development, in the constitution inherited from the fathers. Merely by the accident of climate, soil, and geography was it a sectional struggle.<sup>15</sup>

In this way, according to the Beards, the North was able to position itself to control the American economy and, thereby, transforming itself from an agriculture society to an industrial one.<sup>16</sup>

Another noteworthy Civil War historian is Charles W. Ramsdell. He earned a doctorate at Columbia University and surmised that hostilities could have been avoided. He argued that slavery, if it were not for Northerner “dread,” would have eventually declined and ceased to exist. In his *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* article, “The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion” (1929), Ramsdell wrote in its conclusion that:

It seems evident that slavery had about reached its zenith by 1860 and must shortly have begun to decline, for the economic forces which had carried it into the region west of the Mississippi had about reached their maximum effectiveness ... It had reached its limits in both profits and lands. The free farmers in the North who dreaded its further spread had nothing to fear.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> James Ford Rhodes, *History of the Civil War, 1861-1865* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1917), 1.

<sup>13</sup> Eldridge, 56.

<sup>14</sup> Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*, in Two Volumes, vol. 2, *The Industrial Era* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), 52.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>16</sup> Peter A. Coclanis, “The American Civil War in Economic Perspective: Basic Questions and Some Answers,” *Southern Cultures* 2, no. 2 (Winter 1996): 166, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26235409>.

<sup>17</sup> Chas. W. Ramsdell, “The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion,” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 16, no. 2 (September 1929): 171, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1902899>.

Historians sometimes refer to Ramsdell's theory as the "natural limits" thesis.

A revisionist movement came to be in the 1930s. These historians take a pro-Southern stance and see Northerners as the antagonists who regarded the South as a barrier to Northerner growth. Frank L. Owsley, who can be considered a third-generation historian, is well-known for his essay "The Irrepressible Conflict" which is found in the tome *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition* (1930). In his revisionist essay, Owsley provoked the emotions of many when he wrote that "the North defeated the South in war, crushed and humiliated it in peace, and waged against it a war of intellectual and spiritual conquest. In this conquest, the North fixed upon the South the stigma of war guilt, of slave guilt, of treason, and thereby shook the faith of its people in their way of living and in their philosophy of life."<sup>18</sup> He continued with, "For ten years ex-slaves, led by carpetbaggers and scalawags, continued the pillages of war, combing the South for anything left by the invading armies, levying taxes, selling empires of plantations under the auction hammer, dragooning the Southern population, and visiting upon them the ultimate humiliations."<sup>19</sup> And in this way, Owsley expresses a pro-Southern view that the North were the aggressors who had planned an all-out suppression of the Southern spirit and to gain an economic advantage over the South.

In Avery Craven's journal article, "Coming of the War Between the States: An Interpretation" (1936), he mentioned differences as "economic, social, and political."<sup>20</sup> Craven, an ever more revisionist, proclaimed that "The problem of why these sections went to war lies deeper. It is one of emotions, cultivated hostilities, and ultimately of hatred between sections. Bloodshed was 'necessary' ... because men ... crowned their own interests with moral sanctions."<sup>21</sup> The themes of economics, politics, and social factors recur in many revisionist's works besides that of Craven.

James G. Randall, who is another important revisionist, regarded politicians during the Civil War as a "blundering generation." Randall's article, "The Blundering Generation" (1940), that was published in *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* states "if one word or phrase were selected to account for the war, that word would not be slavery, or state-rights, or diverse civilizations. It would have to be such a word as fanaticism (on both sides), or misunderstanding, or perhaps politics."<sup>22</sup> And with this quote, politics was likely the key for understanding causation according to Randall's revisionist theory.

Another Owsley work, "The Fundamental Cause of the Civil War: Egocentric Sectionalism" (1941), that is worth mentioning is found in *The Journal of Southern History*. In it, he mentions a type of disruption that was "destructive" and a "malignant type of sectionalism that destroyed the Union in 1861."<sup>23</sup> Owsley's also states that "the dominant section" of the country considered "itself

---

<sup>18</sup> Frank Lawrence Owsley, "The Irrepressible Conflict," In *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1930), 66.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 62-63.

<sup>20</sup> Avery Craven, "Coming of the War Between the States: An Interpretation," *The Journal of Southern History* 2, no. 3 (August 1936): 304, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2191911>.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> James G. Randall, "The Blundering Generation," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 27, no. 1 (1940): 15, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1896569>.

<sup>23</sup> Frank L. Owsley, "The Fundamental Cause of the Civil War: Egocentric Sectionalism," *The Journal of Southern History* 7, no. 1 (February 1941): 7, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2191262>.

the sole possessor of nationalism.”<sup>24</sup> He continued that the North eventually thought of the South as “un-American, unworthy of friendly consideration, and even the object of attack.”<sup>25</sup> Undoubtedly, Owsley portrays a fierce revisionist stance against fundamentalism.

In the preface of volume one in the *Ordeal of the Union: Fruits of Manifest Destiny, 1847-1852* (1947), Allan Nevins, in his most famous work, brought up the theme that the war should have been avoidable even though the work has a noticeable pro-Union bias.<sup>26</sup> Nevins’s *Ordeal of the Union* is a multi-volume work that was published between 1947 and 1971. Some historians, like James M. McPherson, considered this to be the best work on the Civil War.<sup>27</sup>

With the arrival of the Civil Rights era of the 1960s, a neo-fundamentalist school of thought emerged to challenge the then dominant view that was held by the revisionist. In David M. Potter’s work, *The Impending Crisis, 1848–1861* (1976), it shows that “from the outset, slavery had been the most serious cause of sectional conflict.”<sup>28</sup> Slavery as causation, a traditional fundamentalist trait, has once again come to the attention of academics after being a non-dominant theme for a few decades. As of 2024, the neo-fundamentalist school is still the dominant view for causation of the American Civil War.

Almost simultaneously occurring and a stark contrast to the emerging neo-fundamentalist movement was a revisionist revival, aptly called neo-revisionism. In one of his works, Michael F. Holt, the leader of the neo-revisionist school of thought, deemed that the collapse of the two-party system led to a crucial breaking point. Michael F. Holt wrote *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (1978) and, in it, he noted:

More was involved in the collapse of the old two-party system, however, than merely the disappearance of the national parties with affiliations across sectional lines. An equally crucial development took place at the state and local levels. There, in the political arenas closest to the people, older frame works of competition also dissolved ... In this vacuum they tried to form new parties to meet their immediate needs, and much of the story of the political reorganization of the 1850s that led to civil war is to be found in those efforts. Local and state politics were just as crucial as national developments in shaping the political crisis of the 1850s.<sup>29</sup>

Once again, the revisionist theme of politics was a reason that led to the outbreak of hostilities, albeit local politics being just as crucial as national.

In his neo-revisionist work, *The Partisan Imperative: The Dynamics of American Politics Before the Civil War* (1985), Joel H. Silbey argued that slavery was not the most significant issue

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Allan Nevins, *Ordeal of the Union: Fruits of Manifest Destiny, 1847-1852*, in Eight Volumes, vol. 1 (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1947), viii.

<sup>27</sup> “James M. McPherson: By the Book,” *New York Times*, October 2, 2014, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/05/books/review/james-m-mcpherson-by-the-book.html?ref=review>.

<sup>28</sup> David M. Potter, *The Impending Crisis, 1848–1861*, ed. Don E. Fehrenbacher (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 52.

<sup>29</sup> Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978), 4.

in American politics. But, rather, it was “antebellum political warfare” that was of primary importance.<sup>30</sup> He states it was “the persistent importance of ethnocultural conflict in America and its deep penetration onto the political scene” which caused the war.<sup>31</sup> For Silbey, partisan politics is an important theme for the revitalized revisionist.

In the mid-1980s and in the neo-fundamentalist vein, Eric Foner released a notable work. Being part of a new generation of historians, Foner noticed, in his *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877* (1988), that new social aspects was redefining historical study.<sup>32</sup> Foner said that he wanted “to view the period as a whole, integrating the social, political, and economic aspects of Reconstruction into a coherent, analytical narrative,”<sup>33</sup> and his goal was to provide a “comprehensive modern account of Reconstruction” while using contemporary scholarship in a “broad interpretive framework.”<sup>34</sup> Foner explores five themes in it. The first is the black experience during this period.<sup>35</sup> The second theme traces the ways in which the South was “remodeled.”<sup>36</sup> The third is to understand the evolution of racial attitudes and relationships including class in the postwar South.<sup>37</sup> The fourth theme explores the new National powers that emerged during and after the war.<sup>38</sup> And finally, Foner looks at how the North's economy and class influenced Reconstruction.<sup>39</sup>

Also released the same year as Foner's work is James M. McPherson's *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (1988). In his Pulitzer Prize winning work, McPherson describes the war as a time of “successive crises, rapid changes, dramatic events, and dynamic transformations.”<sup>40</sup> He highlights “the political and military events of this era with important social and economic developments” that utilizes “up-to-date scholarship.”<sup>41</sup> McPherson presented his work in narrative form rather than presenting it in a topical or thematic way. He explains that many:

Events directly affected the others; none can be understood apart from the whole. A topical or thematic approach that treated military events, diplomacy, slavery and emancipation, anti-war dissent and civil liberties, and northern politics in separate chapters, instead of weaving them together as I have attempted to do here, would leave the reader uninformed about ... the outcome of all these other developments.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Joel H. Silbey, *The Partisan Imperative: The Dynamics of American Politics Before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), xvii.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877* (United States of America: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988), 19.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 22.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>40</sup> James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 90.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 86.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 96.

In a 21st century work, James L. Huston, who wrote *Calculating the Value of the Union: Slavery, Property Rights, and the Economic Origins of the Civil War* (2003), is quoted as saying “obviously slavery was at the center of the sectional quarrel.”<sup>43</sup> His book plainly states his thesis as the “property rights in slaves generated the sectional conflict, that the concentration of valuable property in one region thwarted any attempt at compromise and undermined the genius of the democratic process.”<sup>44</sup> The modes that gave his thesis credibility and provided the basis for his research were the themes of economics and political science.<sup>45</sup>

Outside of the prevailing works of the fundamentalists and revisionists can be found the nondominant themed works of historians who concentrate on Native Americans who participated in the conflict. Although not a major school of thought, micro-historical focused works (or microhistories), as proposed by Brandon M. Eldridge, tend to focus on some aspect within “more extensive scholarship.”<sup>46</sup> One understudied niche is the subject of Native Americans, particularly the Mississippi Choctaw, who engaged in the Western Theater of the American Civil War.<sup>47</sup>

The literature, however brief, does exist and has potential to be developed further. S.G. Spann, who was a first-generation historian, was a Confederate officer for the Mississippi Choctaws. In a magnificently detailed newspaper article entitled “Confederate Choctaws” (1900), Spann wrote, “I established two camps of Choctaw warriors, one at Mobile, Ala., and one in Newton County, Mississippi, on the Meridian Jackson Railroad. This command was styled 1st battalion of Choctaw Indians.”<sup>48</sup> Annie H. Abel is a well-known historian who earned a doctorate from Yale University and came to prominence during the Progressive Era. She wrote a large number of historical works concerning Native Americans who exclusively participated in the Trans-Mississippi Theater. However, Abel was apparently aware of the Mississippi Choctaws’ participation during the grand struggle. In her article, “The Indians in the Civil War” (1910), she wrote of the Mississippi Choctaws in a footnote by stating, “The Choctaws of Mississippi ... were certainly not under [the Trans-Mississippi command of Albert Pike.]”<sup>49</sup> In an innovative non-scholarly study, Laurence M. Hauptman’s *Between Two Fires: American Indians in the Civil War* (1995) surveys Native Americans who were found in both Union and Confederate armies. Within the larger context of other Native American groups, Hauptman briefly mentions the Mississippi Choctaws who were “forced against their will to serve the Confederacy until their mass desertion and capture by Union

---

<sup>43</sup> James L. Huston, *Calculating the Value of the Union: Slavery, Property Rights, and the Economic Origins of the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003), xiii.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., xiv.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., xiii.

<sup>46</sup> Eldridge, 59.

<sup>47</sup> Robert A. Taylor, “Unforgotten Threat: Florida Seminoles in the Civil War,” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (January 1991): 300-314, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30147523>. Taylor mentions that Native Americans were residing in Florida at the outbreak of hostilities. He says, “In 1861 the few remaining Florida Indians, remnants of the once powerful Seminole, Tallahassee, and Mikasuki tribes, were living in the swamps and hammocks of south Florida;” Paul A. Thomsen, *Rebel Chief: The Motley Life of Colonel William Holland Thomas, C. S. A.* (New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 2004). In this non-scholarship work, Thomsen shows that the North Carolina Cherokee had extensively participated in many engagements of the war.

<sup>48</sup> S.G. Spann, “Confederate Choctaws,” *Anderson (SC) Intelligencer*, March 7, 1900, Newspapers.com.

<sup>49</sup> Annie H. Abel, “The Indians in the Civil War,” *The American Historical Review* 15, no. 2 (January 1910): 288, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1838335>.

forces during the onset of the Vicksburg Campaign in the spring of 1863.”<sup>50</sup> Hauptman could be considered a “post-Civil Rights” era historian. And so ends, abruptly, the micro-historical focused works of Native Americans, in this example the Mississippi Choctaw, who participated in the Western Theater of the Civil War.

To summarize and conclude, American Civil War historians can be categorized either as fundamentalist or revisionist. Historians who viewed that the war was inevitable are referred to as fundamentalists. Many fundamentalist historians believed that sectional differences were “irreconcilable.” The key works of Henry Wilson, James Ford Rhodes, and Charles Beard are important for understanding their slavery-centered arguments. On the other hand, historians who have a different interpretation when compared to the fundamentalists are categorized as revisionist. The revisionist believed slavery was not the focal point of the struggle. These particular historians argued for political and economic reasons for causation. Key works by Frank L. Owsley, Avery Craven, and James G. Randall can offer some insight into the revisionist mindset. A “neo” movement took place soon after. Neo-fundamentalist, such as Eric Foner, and neo-revisionist, like Michael F. Holt, had similar dominant views as their predecessors; however, they were more inclined to accept other non-dominant interpretations as well. Historians, along with their fundamentalist or revisionist ties, can also be subcategorized into nondominant perspectives. These additional perspectives can come in the form of economics, politics, and social ideologies; “natural limits” theories; or even micro-historical perspectives.

---

<sup>50</sup> Laurence M. Hauptman, *Between Two Fires: American Indians in the Civil War* (New York: Free Press, 1995), 87.



## Bibliography

### *Books*

- Beard, Charles A. and Mary R. Beard. *The Rise of American Civilization*, in Two Volumes, vol. 1, *The Agricultural Era*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- . *The Rise of American Civilization*, in Two Volumes, vol. 2, *The Industrial Era*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Buchanan, James. *The Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion: A History of Four Years Before the War*. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston, 1865.
- Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863–1877*. United States of America: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988.
- Hauptman, Laurence M. *Between Two Fires: American Indians in the Civil War*. New York: Free Press, 1995.
- Holt, Michael F. *The Political Crisis of the 1850s*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Huston, James L. *Calculating the Value of the Union: Slavery, Property Rights, and the Economic Origins of the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Lincoln, Abraham. "Second Inaugural Address." In *Little Masterpieces*, 102-105. Edited by Bliss Perry. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1903.
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Nevins, Allan. *Ordeal of the Union: Fruits of Manifest Destiny, 1847-1852*, in Eight Volumes, vol. 1. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.
- Owsley, Frank L. "The Irrepressible Conflict." In *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*, 61-91. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1930.
- Pollard, Edward A. *The Lost Cause: A New Southern History of the War of the Confederates*. New York: E.B. Treat & Co., 1866.
- Potter, David M. *The Impending Crisis, 1848–1861*. Edited by Don E. Fehrenbacher. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Rhodes, James Ford. *History of the Civil War, 1861-1865*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1917.

Seward, William H. "The Irrepressible Conflict: A Speech by William H. Seward, Delivered at Rochester, Monday, Oct. 25, 1858." In *The Campaign of 1860*. Albany: Weed, Parsons & Company, 1860.

Silbey, Joel H. *The Partisan Imperative: The Dynamics of American Politics Before the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Thomsen, Paul A. *Rebel Chief: The Motley Life of Colonel William Holland Thomas, C. S. A.* New York: Tom Doherty Associates, 2004.

Wilson, Henry. *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America*, in Three Volumes, vol. 1. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1872.

### *Journal Articles*

Abel, Annie H. "The Indians in the Civil War." *The American Historical Review* 15, no. 2 (January 1910): 281-296. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1838335>.

Coclanis, Peter A. "The American Civil War in Economic Perspective: Basic Questions and Some Answers." *Southern Cultures* 2, no. 2 (Winter 1996): 163-175. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26235409>.

Craven, Avery. "Coming of the War Between the States: An Interpretation." *The Journal of Southern History* 2, no. 3 (August 1936): 303-322. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2191911>.

Eldridge, Brandon M. "The Ever-Evolving Historiography of the American Civil War." *Graduate Review* 1, no. 1 (2021): 55-61.

Greenberg, Kenneth S. "Civil War Revisionism." *Reviews in American History* 7, no. 2 (June 1979): 202-208.

Owsley, Frank L. "The Fundamental Cause of the Civil War: Egocentric Sectionalism." *The Journal of Southern History* 7, no. 1 (February 1941): 3-18. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2191262>.

Ramsdell, Chas. W. "The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 16, no. 2 (September 1929): 151-171. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1902899>.

Randall, James G. "The Blundering Generation." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 27, no. 1 (1940): 3-28. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1896569>.

Taylor, Robert A. "Unforgotten Threat: Florida Seminoles in the Civil War." *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (January 1991): 300-314. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30147523>.

Towers, Frank. "Partisans, New History, and Modernization: The Historiography of the Civil War's Causes, 1861-2011." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 1, no. 2 (June 2011): 237-264. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26070115>.

#### *Newspaper Articles*

"James M. McPherson: By the Book." *New York Times*, October 2, 2014. <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/05/books/review/james-m-mcpherson-by-the-book.html?ref=review>.

Spann, S.G. "Confederate Choctaws." *Anderson (SC) Intelligencer*, March 7, 1900. Newspapers.com.

"Speech of Hon. A.H. Stephens." *Southern Confederacy* (GA), March 25, 1861. Newspapers.com.

#### *Paper*

Schearer, Michael. "Historiography of the Causes of the Civil War." Liberty University, 2020. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3714025>.

\*\*\*

Academic paper by Robert Bruce Ferguson.

©2024 by Robert Bruce Ferguson. All Rights Reserved.