



I'm not robot



Continue

Why did the south secede

The introduction of the Civil War was a famous war taught in every school. Students of all age groups know at least something about this war. The war lasted from 1861-1865 and divided the nation to the north and south. Although this war is very well known and thoroughly researched, there is still a lot of debate about the cause of the war. Some historians claim that the main cause of the Civil War was the institution of Slavery. Southern states need these institutions to help their main economic sources; Agriculture. The northern states, however, are mainly manufacturing countries and do not have a great need for slavery. The opposite belief is that the Civil War was fought over state rights. Southern states claim that their rights were taken up by the federal government with their voices reduced and slavery taken away. Some say that it is not just the fact that their institutions of slavery are being taken away; on the contrary, the problem is that the federal government even has the power to do so. In many cases today, northern states believe the main problem is slavery while southern states believe the main issue is state rights. So, which one's right? Why do southern states break away from unions? What is Secession? The act of separation is not an easy thing, and once a country decides to do so, it will change the nation drastically. Secession is the act of the state officially leaving the Union. Many believe that secession is what causes war as well. With the southern states actively leaving the Union, war broke out. The states that are segregated are South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana. Next, Virginia split in two (West Virginia and Virginia) and Virginia separated, followed by Arkansas, North Carolina, and Tennessee. These newly segregated southern states then elected Jefferson Davis as president of the Confederation (a state that seceded from the Union/United States). The buildup to the war... During the early 1800s it became quietly clear that the north and south grew apart in not only ideology but also culture. As northern industries continue to grow and thrive with the wave of immigrants coming to the U.S. in search of the American Dream the south continues to rely heavily on the institutions of slavery. Many southerners think the north is full of abolitionists who are just trying to push big government as well as industrial progress on them. For the average southerner this is an attack on their culture. This fracture only grew between the two cultures when the United States began to expand into west and more states will begin applying for Statehood. Will the new state be considered a slave state or a free country? If one side gets the country, the other side will need to get one as In 1819, the Missouri Compromise threatened to disrupt the balance of slaves to liberate states in the United States because there would be twenty-three states in the Union (12 slaves and 11 free). The Missouri compromise only confirms to many southerners that national governments can create laws that oppose slavery and reduce the power of state governments in the process. Soon after, the 1828 Tariff appeared. Also considering the abomination rates by its southern counterparts, these tariffs were imposed in the hope of protecting the industry in the north. Northern factories are being ruled out of business due to lower prices of imported goods. To combat this problem the United States would put taxes on them to push its prices up so that southern people would have to pay more money for goods not produced in the U.S. In 1854, the infamous Kansas-Nebraska Act took place. Because the territory lies above the line created by the Missouri Compromise, many southern congressmen are in no hurry to push for statehood because anything above the line would not be allowed to hold slaves. However, Stephen Douglas of Illinois encouraged the region's acceptance as a slave-holding state to get help from the southern masses. His proposed bill was eventually passed and caused serious divisions in the United States government. Other historical markers such as the Dred Scott Decree, the 1860 Election, and many other events marked this trip to the Civil War in 1861. All of these situations provide important background information for the cause of the Civil War. In conclusion, the Civil War may not be as black and white as we would like to believe. Every year, there is new research that reveals new information about the causes of the Civil War. Is that a combination of the two? It's hard to say exactly what argument sounds because there are so many sides to the story. It is our duty, as historians, to discover the truth behind the cause of the infamous Civil War. In the North, it is usually taught that Slavery is the main problem. In the South, it is usually taught that The Rights of the State are the real problem. What do we believe? Is the textbook correct or un-informed? What do students actually learn about the Civil War? So, what caused the Civil War? Is that slavery or state rights? Is there only one cause or combination of several? Using the above Background Information and documents on this website, come to your own conclusions! States leaving the Union In the context of the United States, separation primarily refers to the voluntary withdrawal of one or more states from the Union that constitute the United States; But refers to leaving a state or territory to form a separate new territory or state, or to sever an area from a city or county within a state. Advocates for secession are called expulsions by their contemporaries in various historical documents. Threats and aspirations to secede from the United States, or arguments justifying secession, have been a hallmark of the country's politics almost since its birth. Some people argue secession as a constitutional right and others like from the natural right of revolution. In Texas v. White (1869), the Supreme Court ruled unilateral separation unconstitutional, while commenting that revolution or state consent could lead to successful secession. The most serious secession efforts were advanced in 1860 and 1861 as 11 Southern states each declared secession from the United States, and joined together to form the Confederate State of America. The movement collapsed in 1865 with the defeat of Confederate forces by Union forces in the American Civil War. [1] The American Revolution Declaration of Independence states: We hold these truths to be clear, that all people are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creators with certain unalienable Rights, that among them is Life, Freedom and the pursuit of Happiness.—That in order to secure these rights, the Government is institutionalized among Men, gaining their power only from the ruled consent,—that every time a form of Government becomes corrupting its ends, it is the Right of the People to change or abolish it, and to institute a new Government, lay its foundation on such principles and regulate its power in such a form, because to them it seems most likely to affect their Salvation and Happiness. [2] Historian Pauline Maier argues that this narrative asserts the right of revolution, which, however, the right Americans exercised in 1776; and noted that Thomas Jefferson's language included ideas described at length by a long list of 17th-century writers, including John Milton, Algernon Sidney, John Locke, and other English and Scottish commentators, all of whom had contributed to the development of Whig traditions in 18th-century England. [2] The revolutionary rights expressed in the Declaration were immediately followed by the observation that long-practiced injustices were tolerated until sustained attacks on the rights of all the people had gathered enough power to oppress them; [3] then they can defend themselves. [5] This reason is not original for the Declaration, but can be found in many previous political writings: Two Reign of Locke (1690); Fairfax Resolves in 1774; Jefferson's own summary view of British American Rights; Virginia's first Constitution, enacted five days before the Declaration; [6] and Thomas Paine's Common Sense (1776): The people of the Long-established Time appointed by the Government have not changed, so let not the life of this world become a fire. human beings are more banished to suffer, while Satan suffers, than to correct themselves by abolishing the Form (Government, addition of editors) that they are accustomed to. But when the train is long in violation and permutation, chasing... design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to dispose of the Government, and to provide the new Guard for their future security. [7] Gordon S. Wood quoted President John Adams: Only repeated and multiple repression placed him beyond all doubt that their rulers had formed a finalized plan to deprive them of their freedom, able to guarantee the resistance of the defendants to their rule. [8] The Civil War-era political and legal view of the overview of secession With origins in the question of state rights, the issue of secession was debated in many forums and advocated from time to time in the North and South within decades of adopting the Constitution and before the American Civil War. Historian Maury Klein describes the contemporary debate: Is the Republic a united nation in which individual states have joined, or are federations of sovereign states joining together for a

specific purpose from which they can withdraw at any time? [9] He observed that this case could be made that no outcome of the [American Civil] war was more important than destruction, once and for all... the idea of secession. [10] Historian Forrest McDonald argues that after adopting the Constitution, there are no guidelines, either in theory or in history, as to whether the compact can be dissolved and, if so, under what conditions. However, during the founding era, many public figures... states that states can interposition their power between their citizens and the power of the federal government, and talk of secession is unknown. But according to McDonald, to avoid using the violence that has accompanied the Revolution, the Constitution sets out a legitimate way for future constitutional change. As a result, the Constitution completed and perfected the Revolution. [11] Whatever the Intentions of the Founders, the threat of secession and division was constant in American political discourse before the Civil War. Historian Elizabeth R. Varon writes: [O]ne of the words [schism] is contained, and stimulated, their [American'] fear of extreme political factionalism, regionalism, economic decline, foreign intervention, class conflict, gender disorders, racial strife, pervasiveness, all of which can be interpreted as God's retaliation for America's moral failures. The split marked the dissolution of the republic—the failure of the Founding Fathers to form a stable and enduring representative government. For many Americans in the North and South, division is a nightmare, a tragic disaster that will reduce them to the kind of fear and misery that seems to be around the world. However, for many other Americans, division serves as the primary instrument by which they can achieve their political goals. [12] Leaving the Articles of confederation in late 1777, the Second Continental Congress approved the Articles of confederation for ratification by each state. The Confederate government was de facto administered by Congress under the terms of the draft Article approved (final) until they reached ratification—and de jure status—as early as 1781. In 1786 delegates from five states (the Annapolis Convention) called for a delegate convention in Philadelphia to amend the Articles, which would require unanimous approval from all thirteen states. Philadelphia convention delegates convened and consulted from May to September 1787. Instead of pursuing their official charges, they returned a new Draft Constitution, proposed to build and manage a new federal—then also known as national—government. They further proposed that the draft Constitution not be submitted to Congress (where it would require unanimous approval from states); otherwise that it is presented directly to states for ratification in special ratification conventions, and that approval by at least nine state conventions will be sufficient to adopt a new Constitution and initiate a new federal government; and that only countries that ratify the Constitution will be included in the new government. (For the time being, the original eleven states operated under the Constitution without two states that did not ratify, Rhode Island and North Carolina.) As a result, delegates are proposing to abandon and replace the Confederate Articles rather than change them. [a] Since the Articles have established lasting unity, various arguments have been offered to explain the obvious contradictions (and consider illegality) of abandoning one form of government and creating another that does not include the original members. [b] One explanation is that the Articles of the Confederation simply fail to protect the vital interests of each state. The need then, rather than legality, is a practical factor in abandoning the Articles. [14] According to historian John Ferling, in 1786 the Union under article fell apart. James Madison of Virginia and Alexander Hamilton of New York—those who joined together to vigorously promote the new Constitution—urged that the stability of the renewed Union government be urgently needed to protect and trade. Both founders were strong advocates for stronger central government; They're Them The Federalist Papers to advocate for their purpose and known as federalists. (Because of his strong advocacy Madison was later awarded the honor of Father of the Constitution.) [c] Ferling writes: Rumors of a possible movement have been released. There is also buzz that some countries plan to leave the United States and form regional confederations. The Americans, it is said, will go down the path of Europe, and eventually three or four, or more confederations will emerge. ... The Confederacy was not only able to take measures that were beyond the capabilities of Congress under the article, but privately some described such a move in a positive light, as much as possible as regional unions could adopt a constitution that secures property rights and maintains order. [d] Another argument that justifies abandoning the Articles of confederation describes the Articles as an international compact between unconsolidated and sovereign states, one of which is empowered to leave the compact as unilaterally as possible. (This is contrary to a consolidated union that is completely annihilated, without the power of the rise of a sovereign state.) [17] These articles require that all countries be obliged to comply with all terms of the agreement; thus, permanently related to compliance. 'Compliance' is usually considered a matter of interpretation by each state. Emerich de Vattel, a recognized authority on international law, wrote at the time that the Treaty contained perfect and reciprocal promises. If one ally fails in his involvement, the other may... break away in his promises, and... violate the agreement. [17] As such, each state can unilaterally 'separate' from the Confederate Articles as it seems; this argument for abandoning the Articles—because of its weaknesses in the face of secession—was used by advocates for the new Constitution and featured by James Madison in Federalist No. 43. [e] St. George Tucker, an influential legal expert in the early days of the republic, and especially in the South, argued that abandoning the Confederate Articles was tying itself to segregate from the Government's Articles. In 1803, he wrote that the unanimous dissolution of the Confederate Articles in 1789 by the Act of Congress was a legal precedent for the future separation of the Constitution from one state at a time by state legislatures. And since the separation states, by establishing a new constitution and a form of federal government among themselves, without the consent of the rest, have shown that they consider the right to do so whenever the opportunity may be, in their opinion requires it, we may conclude that the right has not been diminished by the new compact that may since then they, because nothing could be more solemn or explicit than the first, or more binding on a partie contract. [19] Others, such as Chief Justice John Marshall who a Virginia delegate to the Convention on Ratification (Federal), argued that ratifying the Constitution is a precedent for the future dissolution of a one-time Union by an isolated state or state. Writing in 1824, precisely in the middle between the fall of the Confederate Articles and the emergence of the second self-described Confederate America, Marshall summed up the issue thus: References had been made to the political situation of these countries, anterior to the establishment of the [Constitution]. It has been said that they are sovereign, completely independent, and connected to each other only by the league. It's true. But, when these sovereign allies turn their leagues into governments, when they change their ambassadorial congresses, deputies to deliberate over their shared concerns, and to recommend public utility measures, into legislatures, empowered to enact laws on the most interesting subjects, the whole character in which states appear to undergo change. [20] Nationalists for Unity in the American antebellum argue the opposite of secession; that indeed the new Constitution inherits immortality from the language in the Articles and from other actions taken before the Constitution. Historian Kenneth Stampp explains their views: Lacking an explicit clause in the Constitution with which to establish the immortality of the Union, the nationalists made their case, first, with a unique interpretation of the country's history before the Philadelphia Convention; second, with conclusions drawn from certain Passages of the Constitution; and third, with a careful selection of the speeches and writings of the Founding Fathers. The historical case begins with the postulation that the Union is older than the state. It cites a reference in the Declaration of Independence for these unified colonies, argues that the Second Continental Congress actually calls the states to be [i.e., colonies no longer], notes the provision for perpetual Unity in the Confederations Articles, and concludes with a reminder that the opening of a new constitution provides as one of its goals the formation of a more perfect Union. [21] Adopting the Constitution of this Section is written in the style of debate rather than an encyclopedic summary. It may require cleaning to meet Wikipedia's quality standards and make it more accessible to the general audience. Please discuss this issue on the talk page. (February 2017) (Learn how and when to delete this template message) Constitutional scholar Akhil Reed Amar argues that the immortality of the Union of the state changed significantly when the U.S. Constitution replaced the Confederate Articles. This action marks a decisive break with the regime of the Articles of Association of state sovereignty. [22] By adopting a constitution—not a treaty, compact instruments, or confederate instruments, etc.—etc.—a new governing body designed to be senior to several states, and by approving certain language and provisions of the new Constitution, framers and voters explain that the fate of each state (severely) changes; and that the new United States is: Not a league, but an assertive; not a confederation or a confederation; not compact among sovereign states, by—although certain language and legally transported words of the Articles are conspicuously absent from the Preamble opening and any other operating part of the Constitution. The new text proposes a fundamentally different legal framework. [23] Patrick Henry firmly opposed adopting the Constitution because he interpreted his language to replace the sovereignty of individual states, including his own Virginia. He cast his vote strongly for anti-federalist causes at odds with federalists led by Madison and Hamilton. Questioning the nature of the proposed new federal government, Henry asked: Fate... America may depend on this. ... Did they make a compact proposal between the states? If they had, this would be a confederation. Otherwise, this is the most obvious government. The question turned, sir, to that poor little thing—the expression, We, the people, not the state, america. ... [24] The federalists recognized that national sovereignty would be transferred by the new Constitution to all Americans—indeed, assuming the phrase, We the people.... They argued, however, that Henry exaggerated the extent to which consolidated governance was being created and that countries would serve an important role in the new republic even though their national sovereignty was over. To be honest, on the issue of whether countries retain the right to unilaterally secede from the United States, the federalists made it clear that no such right would exist under the Constitution. [25] Amar specifically cited the example of New York's ratification as a suggestion that the Constitution does not count segregation. Anti-federalists dominate the Poughkeepsie Convention that would ratify the Constitution. Worried that the new compact might not adequately protect state rights, the anti-federalists sought to insert into the language of New York's ratification message to the effect that there should be a backup to new York state's right to withdraw itself from the union after a few years. [26] Madison's federalists opposed this, with Hamilton, a delegate at the Convention, reading aloud in response to a letter from James Madison stating: The Constitution requires adoption in toto, and for good [emphasis added]. Hamilton and John Jay later told the Convention that in their view, keeping the right to withdraw [is] not with the Constitution, and does not The New York Convention ultimately ratified the Constitution without including the language of the right to appeal proposed by anti-federalists. Amar explains how the Constitution impacts on state sovereignty: In contrast to Article VII—which rules unanimously that no country can bind another country affirming the sovereignty of each country before 1787—Article V does not allow a single-state convention to modify the federal Constitution for itself. Moreover, it is clear that a state may be bound by an amendment to the federal constitution even if that state voted against the amendment in a properly organized state convention. And this flat rule is inconsistent with the idea that states remain sovereign after joining the Constitution, even if they were sovereign before joining it. Thus, the ratification of the Constitution itself marks the moment when previous sovereign states ceded their sovereignty and legal independence. [27] The natural right of revolution versus the right to debate secession about the legality of segregation often looks back to the example of the American Revolution and the Declaration of Independence. Law professor Daniel Farber defines what he considers to be the frontier of this debate: What about genuine understanding? The debate contains scattered statements about the immortality or impartiality of the Union. Occasional references to the impartiality of the Constitution are difficult to interpret. They may have been referring to the legal right to revoke ratification. But they could equally refer to the right of extrastitutional revolution, or the possibility that a new national convention would rewrite the Constitution, or simply for the factual possibility that a national government might be corrupted. Similarly, a reference to the permanency of the Union could refer to a practical impractical withdrawal rather than a lack of legal force. The public debate does not appear to speak specifically as to whether ratification under Article VII can be revoked. [28] In the public debate on the Nullification Crisis, the issue of secession was also discussed. James Madison, often referred to as the Father of the Constitution, strongly opposes the argument that segregation is permitted by the Constitution. [29] On March 15, 1833, in a letter to Daniel Webster (congratulating him on a speech opposing annulment), Madison discussed revolution versus secession: I give back my thanks for a copy of your powerful Speech in the United S Senate. This destroys the annulment and should hasten the waiver of separation. But this avoids a blow by confusing claims to separate one's possible bundles, with the right to secede from oppression that cannot be tolerated. The first answers itself, being transgressed, without cause, faith solemnly promised. The latter is another name only for the revolution, which does not exist Controversy. [30] As such Madison asserts an extrastitutional right to rebel against conditions of oppression that cannot be tolerated; but if this case cannot be made (that such a condition exists), then he rejects secession—as a violation of the Constitution. During the crisis, President Andrew Jackson, issued his Proclamation to the People of South Carolina, which made the case for the immortality of the Union; plus, he gave his view back to the question of revolution and segregation:[31] But each State has expressly parted with so much power to form together with another State one nation, it cannot from that period have the right to secede, since such separation does not violate the league, but destroys the unity of the nation, and any injury to that union is not only an offence that will result from contravention, but it is a violation of the entire Union. [emphasis added] To say that any State might gladly secede from the Union, is to say that the United States is not a nation because it would be the only one to argue that any part of a nation might dissolve its relationship with another part, for their injury or destruction, without committing an offense. Segregation, like other revolutionary actions, can be morally justified by the extremities of oppression; but to call it a constitutional right, is confusing the meaning of the term, and can only be done through gross error, or to deceive those who are willing to assert the right, but will stop before they make a revolution, or inflict punishment for failure. [32] Some twenty-eight years after Jackson spoke, President James Buchanan voted differently—one accommodating the views of the divider and the 'slave' states—in the midst of the pre-War separation crisis. In his final State of the Union address to Congress, on 3 December 1860, he acknowledged his view that the South, having first used all peaceful and constitutional means for redress, would be justified in its revolutionary resistance to the Government of the Union; but he also withdrew his apocalyptic vision of the expected outcome of secession:[33] To justify secession as a constitutional remedy, it must be on the principle that the Federal Government is a mere voluntary state association, to be disbanded with pleasure by one of the contracting parties. [emphasis added] If so, the Confederacy [here referring to the existing Union] is a sand rope, to be penetrated and dissolved by the first wave of adverse public opinion in any of the States. In this way thirty-three Countries we can resolve themselves to as much as small, jarring, and hostile republicans, each retiring from the Union without responsibility whenever sudden excitement might hold them back for such a course. With this process, the Union may be completely compromised in a few weeks that harmed our ancestors years of hard work, privacy, and blood to build. [34] Alien and Sedition Acts Responded to the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798—advanced by the Federalist Party—John Taylor of the Virginia House of Delegates spoke, urging Virginia to secede from the United States. He argued—as one of the many vociferous responses by Jefferson's Republicans—a sense of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, adopted in 1798 and 1799, that proposed to those States the rights of secession and interposition (annulment). [35] Thomas Jefferson, while sitting as Vice President of the United States in 1799, wrote to James Madison about his belief in the reservation of the rights [those] that resulted to us from this apparent violation [of the Alien and Sedition Act] and, if the federal government does not return to the true principles of our federal compact, [he is determined to] decide for himself from that union, we greatly appreciate, rather than giving up the rights of self-government that we have ordered, and anywhere we see freedom, safety and happiness. [emphasis added] [36] Here Jefferson argued with a radical voice (and in a personal letter) that he would lead the movement for secession; but it is unclear whether he is arguing for a bundle-like separation or for a revolution because oppression cannot be tolerated (see above), or not. Jefferson secretly wrote (one of) the Kentucky Resolutions, which he did—again—while he was Vice President. His biographer Dumas Malone argued that, if his actions were known at the time, Jefferson's participation might have led to him being impeached for (charged with) treason. [37] In writing the first Kentucky Resolution, Jefferson warned that, unless captured at the threshold, Alien and Sedition Acts would always push these countries into revolution and blood. Historian Ron Chernow says of this he does not call for peaceful protests or civil disobedience: he calls for an outright uprising, if necessary, against the federal government in which he is vice president. Jefferson thus established a radical doctrine of state rights that effectively undermined the constitution. [38] Jefferson's Republicans were not alone in claiming reserve rights against the federal government. Contributing to the rancorous debate during the War of 1812, Founding Father Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania and New York—a Federalist, Hamilton ally and lead author of the Constitution that advanced the concept that Americans were citizens of one state Union—was persuaded to claim that secession was, under certain circumstances, entirely constitutional. [39] Federalist New England The Hartford Convention election of 1800 showed Jefferson's Democratic-Republican party rising and federalists declining, and feel threatened by initiatives taken by their opponents. They found Jefferson's unilateral purchase of the Louisiana territory in violation of a basic agreement between the original 13 states; Jefferson transacted the purchase in secret and refused to seek Congressional approval. The new lands anticipate some future western states that federalists fear will be dominated by Democrats-Republicans. Other things added to the Federalist alarm, such as the impeachment of Federalist district judge John Pickering by Jefferson-dominated Congress, and similar attacks on Pennsylvania state officials by the Democratic-Republican legislature. In 1804, their national leadership was destroyed and their viable bases were reduced to the states of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Delaware. [40] Timothy Pickering of Massachusetts and several Federalists envisioned creating a separate New England confederation, perhaps combining with lower Canada to form a new pro-British state. The Embargo Act of 1807 was seen as a threat to the Massachusetts economy, and the state legislature debated in May 1808 how the state should respond. These debates produce isolated references to secession, but no plot is certain to materialize. [41] Historian Richard Buell, Jr. suggested that the 1804 movement was more an acknowledgment of desperation about the future than a realistic proposal for action. [42] Members of the Federalist party convened the Hartford Convention on 15 December 1814, and they discussed their opposition to the ongoing war with England and the dominance of the federal government by the Virginia dynasty. Twenty-six delegates were present; Massachusetts sent 12, Connecticut seven, and Rhode Island four. New Hampshire and Vermont declined, but two counties each of the states sent delegates. [43] Historian Donald R. Hickey noted: Despite pleas in the New England press for secession and segregated peace, most of the delegates who took part in the Hartford Convention were determined to pursue a moderate course. Only Timothy Bigelow of Massachusetts seemed to like extreme measures, and he played no major role in the proceedings. [43] The final report discussed issues related to the country's war and defense, and recommended several constitutional amendments. [45] Massachusetts and Connecticut supported it, but the war ended when delegates returned to Washington, effectively undoing any impact it might have. Jefferson's people described the convention as a synonym for disloyalty and betrayal, and it became a major factor in the sharp decline of the Federalist Party. [46] Abolysis for separation Lloyd Garrison—Furthermore, the keyword of every uncompromising abolisher, of every friend of God and freedom, must, both in the religious and political sense — 'NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS'[47] SLAVEHOLDERS'[47] began to escalate between North and South in the late 1830s over slavery and related problems. Many Northerners, especially New Englanders, see themselves as victims of a political conspiracy between slaves and western expansionists. They viewed the movement to annex Texas and to make the war in Mexico as fomented by slaves determined to dominate western expansion and thus national fate. New England analyst Benjamin Lundy argues that the annexation of Texas was a long-planned crusade—a walk by slaves, land speculators, etc., with views of rebuilding, extending, and perpetuation of the system of slavery and the slave trade. [48] Newspaper editors began demanding separation from the South. Wm. Lloyd Garrison called for secession in The Liberator of May 1844 with address to the Friends of Freedom and Emancipation in the United States. The Constitution was created, he wrote, at the expense of the country's population of color, and Southern people dominated the nation because of the Three-Fifths Compromise; it is time to free the captives by the potential for truth and to secede from the government. [49] Coincidentally, the New England Anti-Slavery Convention supported the divisive principles by a vote of 250–24. [50] Secession support began to shift to southern states from 1846, following the introduction of Wilmot Proviso into public debate. Southern leaders are increasingly feeling powerless against powerful political groups attacking their interests, reminiscent of the Federalist alarm of the beginning of the century. South Carolina During Andrew Jackson's presidential term, South Carolina had a semi-secession movement of its own due to the so-called Abomination Tariff of 1828, which threatened the economy of South Carolina, and South Carolina, in turn, threatened to secede from the United States (Union). Jackson also threatened to send federal troops to lay down the movement and hang the dividing leader from the tallest tree in South Carolina. Also because of this, Jackson's vice president, John C. Calhoun, who supported the movement and wrote the essay The South Carolina Exposition and Protest, became the first U.S. vice president to resign. On May 1, 1833, Jackson wrote about the cancellation, the tariff was just a pretext, and the divisions and the Southern Confederacy were the real objects. The next pretext is the, or the question of slavery. [51] South Carolina also threatened to secede in 1850 over the issue of California statehood. It became the first state to declare its separation from the Union on December 20, 1860, with the Declaration of Immediate Causes Inducing and Justifying south Carolina's separation from the Federal Union, and then joining other Southern states to form Confederate States of America under the control of the CSA CSA and territories represented in the U.S. government and the CSA See the main articles Origins of the American Civil War, Confederate States of America and American Civil War. The most famous secession movement is the case of the southern united states. Secession from the United States was accepted in eleven states (and failed in two other states). The breakaway states joined together to form the Confederate States of America (CSA). Eleven CSA states, in order to date their separation (listed in parentheses), are: South Carolina (December 20, 1860), Mississippi (January 9, 1861), Florida (January 10, 1861), Alabama (January 11, 1861), Georgia (January 19, 1861), Louisiana (January 26, 1861), Texas (February 1, 1861), Virginia (April 17, 1861), Arkansas (May 6, 1861), North Carolina (May 20, 1861), and Tennessee (June 8, 1861), and Tennessee (June 8, 1861), and Tennessee (June 8, 1861), and Tennessee (8, 1861). Secession was declared by pro-Confederate governments in Missouri and Kentucky (see Missouri's Confederate government and Kentucky's Confederate government), but did not become effective because it was opposed by their pro-Union state governments. This secession movement brought american civil war. The Union's position is that the Confederation was not a sovereign nation — and never was, but that the Union was always one nation with the intention of its own state, from 1776 onwards — and thus that rebellion had been initiated by the individual. Historian Bruce Catton described President Abraham Lincoln's April 15, 1861, proclamation after the attack on Fort Sumter, which defined the Union's position on hostilities: After reading the obvious fact that the combination was too strong to be suppressed by ordinary and marshall law courts it had taken over affairs in seven states, announcing that several States of the Union were called to contribute 75,000 militias.. to suppress the combination and cause the law to be executed duly. ... And I here i order the people putting together the combination mentioned above to disperse, and retire peacefully to their respective residences within twenty days from this date. [52] The disputed legality of unilateral separation of the Constitution does not directly mention secession. [53] The legality of secession was hotly debated in the 19th century. Although the Federalist Party briefly explored the separation of New England during the War of 1812, secession became associated with the Southern states as North Korea's industrial power increased. [54] The Supreme Court consistently interprets the Constitution as an indestructible union. [53] The Articles of the Confederation are explicitly Perpetual Union; The U.S. Constitution declares itself to be a more perfect union than the Confederate Articles. [55] Other scholars, while not always disagreeing that secession is illegal, point out that sovereignty is often de facto an Questions. If the Confederacy wins, any illegality of its actions under U.S. law will be made irrelevant, just as the undisputed illegality of american rebellion under British law of 1775 is made irrelevant. Thus, these scholars argue, the illegality of unilateral separation was not firmly de facto established until the Union won the Civil War; in this view, the legal question is settled in Appomattox. [56] The Supreme Court ruled Texas v. White[55] was argued before the United States Supreme Court during his December 1868 term. Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase reads the court's decision, on April 15, 1869. [57] Australian professors Peter Radan and Aleksandar Pavkovic wrote: Chase, [Chief Justice], ruled in favor of Texas on the grounds that the Confederate state government in Texas had no legal presence on the basis that texas' separation from the United States was illegal. The critical finding underlying the ruling that Texas could not secede from the United States was that, upon entering the United States in 1845, Texas had become part of an indestructible union, made up of indestructible states. In practical terms, this means that Texas never seceded from the United States. [58] However, the Court's decision recognized several possible divisions through the revolution, or through the consent of the United States. [58] In 1877, Williams v. Bruffy's decree[60] was granted, relating to Civil War debts. The Court writes of the actions that make up an independent government that the Validity of its actions, whether against the parent country or its citizens or subject matter, depends entirely on its ultimate success; if it fails to establish itself permanently, all such actions perish with it; if successful and recognized, his actions from the beginning of his existence are upheld as an independent nation. [61] The union as the sovereign state historian Kenneth Stampp notes that a historical case against secession has been made which holds that the Union is older than the state and that the provision for perpetual Unity in the Articles of confederation is brought into the Constitution by a reminder that the opening of a new Constitution gives us one of its purposes of forming a 'more perfect Union'. [21] Regarding the decision White Stamp wrote: In 1869, when the Supreme Court, in Texas v. White, ultimately dismissed as an indefensible case for a constitutional right to secession, emphasized this historical argument. Unions, the Court says, have never been purely artificial and arbitrary relationships. Instead, it begins between colonies. ... It was confirmed and strengthened by the need for war, and received a definite form, and and sanctions of the Articles of confederation. [21] The separation of Texas from Mexico, the Republic of Texas, broke away, Mexico in 1836 (this, however, took the form of a direct uprising against Mexico, and claimed there was no warrant under the Mexican Constitution to do so). Mexico refuses to recognize its rebellious province as an independent state, but the world's major countries do admit it. In 1845, Congress recognized Texas as a state. The documents governing Texas' accession to the United States do not mention secession rights—although they do increase the likelihood of dividing Texas into several states within the Union. Mexico warned that annexation meant war and the Mexican-American War followed in 1846. [62] State partition Article IV, Section. 3, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution provides: a New State is acceptable to Congress into this Union; but no new State will be established or established in the Jurisdiction of any other State; or any state formed by the Intersection of two or more States, or any part of the State, without the Legislative Approval of the states concerned and Congress. The separation in question is not a split but a partition. Some movements to partition countries have identified themselves as sessionist movements. Of the new states recognized by Congress, three depart from existing states.[63] while one is established on land claimed by the existing state after being there for several years as a de facto independent republic. They are: Vermont was accepted as a new state in 1791[64] after the New York legislature submitted its claim to the territory in 1790. New York's claim that Vermont (also known as New Hampshire Grants) is legally part of New York and remains a matter of contention. King George III, ruled in 1764 that the territory belonged to the Province of New York. Kentucky was part of Virginia until it was accepted as a new state in 1792[65] with Virginia legislative approval in 1789. Maine was part of Massachusetts until it was accepted as a new state in 1820[67] after the Massachusetts legislature approved it in 1819. West Virginia was part of Virginia until it was accepted as a new state in 1863[68] after the restored Virginia General Assembly approved it in 1862. [69] The question of whether the Virginia legislature agrees is controversial, since Virginia is one of the Confederate states. However, antisectionist Virginians formed a government in exile, which was recognized by the United States and approved the partition of the state. Then, with its ruling in Virginia v. West Virginia (1871), the Supreme Court implicitly affirmed that the county of Virginia self does have the proper consent necessary to become a separate state. [70] See also: Entry to the Union Many failed proposals for U.S. state partition have been withdrawn. 1980s—present End 20 efforts and early 21 21 have seen examples of local and state segregation movements. All such moves to create new countries have failed. The establishment in 1971 of the Libertarian Party and its national platform affirmed the right of the state to secede on three vital principles: We will support the recognition of the right to secede. Units or political areas that conduct secession must be recognized by the United States as independent political entities where: (1) segregation is supported by a majority in a political unit, (2) the majority do not attempt repression against different minorities, and (3) the government of the new entity is at least compatible with human freedom as it is left behind. [71] The separation of the city there was an attempt by Staten Island to break away from New York City in the late 1980s and early 1990s, leading to the 1993 referendum, in which 65% voted to secede. Implementation was blocked in the State Assembly by a statement that the state constitution requires a message of house rules from New York City. [72] The San Fernando Valley lost the vote to secede from Los Angeles in 2002. Although the majority (55%) from an valley in an L.A. city restricting voting for secession, the city council unanimously voted to block the valley's partition north of Mulholland Drive. Other city split drive efforts include Killington, Vermont, which has voted twice (2005 and 2006) to join New Hampshire; the community of Miller Beach, Indiana, was originally a separate incorporated community, to split from the cities of Gary in 2007 and Northeast Philadelphia to split from the city of Philadelphia in the 1980s. Part of the city of Calabash, North Carolina, voted to secede from the city in 1998 after receiving permission for a referendum on the issue from the state of North Carolina. After secession, the area incorporated itself as the town of Carolina Shores. Despite the split, cities continue to share fire and emergency services. [73] The City of Rough and Ready, California declared its separation from the Union as the Great Republic of Rough and Ready on April 7, 1850, largely to avoid mining taxes, but voted to rejoin the Union less than three months later on July 4. [74] The separation of countries Some state movements seek secession from the United States itself and the formation of a nation from one or more states. Alaska: In November 2006, the Alaska Supreme Court held in the case Kohlhaas v. It states that secession is illegal and refuses to allow the initiative to be presented to the people of Alaska for a vote. The Alaska Independence Party remained a factor in state politics, and Walter Hickel, a member of the party, was Governor from 1990 to 1994. [75] California: Separation of California, known as #CALEXIT, it was discussed by grassroots movement parties and small activist groups that called on the state to secede from unions at a pro-secessionist meeting in Sacramento Sacramento April 15th, 2010. [76] In 2015, a political action committee called the Yes California Independence Committee was formed to advocate for California's independence from the United States. [77] On January 8, 2016, the California Secretary of State's office confirmed that a political body called the California National Party filed appropriate documents to begin qualifying as a political party. [79] The California National Party, whose primary goal is California independence, ran a candidate for the State Assembly on June 7, 2016. [80] On November 9, 2016, after Donald Trump won the presidential election, the nation's population caused #calexit to trend on Twitter, wanting to leave the country because of his victory; they argue that they have the 6th largest economy in the world, and more population than any other state in the union. [81] 32% of Californians, and 44% of California Democrats supported California's split in the March 2017 poll. [82] The California Attorney General approved applications by the California Freedom Coalition and others to collect signatures to put #CALEXIT on the 2018 ballot. [84] In July 2018, the calexit initiative's goal was expanded by including a plan to carve out an autonomous Native American state[85] that would take eastern California, and delaying its voting referendum approach in order to convince Republican states to support their escape efforts. [85] Florida: Mock 1982 protests[86] by Conch Republicans in the Florida Keys resulted in an ongoing source of local pride and tourist entertainment. In 2015, right-wing activist Jason Patrick Sager called on Florida to secede. [88] Georgia: On April 1, 2009, the Georgia State Senate passed a resolution, 43–1, affirming the state's right to overturn federal laws in some circumstances. The resolution also asserts that if Congress, the president, or the federal judiciary takes certain steps, such as establishing martial law without state consent, requiring some kind of accidental slavery, take any action regarding religion or restrict political free speech, or establish a further ban on the type or number of firearms or ammunition, the constitution stipulates the United States government will be considered void and unions will be considered null and the union will be dissolved[90] Hawaii: The Hawaii sovereignty movement has a number of active groups that have won some concessions from the state of Hawaii, including the offering of H.R. 258 in March 2011, which removed the words of the Annexation Treaty from a law. By 2011[update], it had passed the committee's recommendations 6–0. [91] Minnesota: The Northwest Angle is a small excretion of Minnesota north to Canada because of the peculiarities in the definition of the U.S.-Canada border. Due to laws restricting fishing, some residents Angle suggested leaving the United States and joining Canada in 1997. The following year, U.S. Representative Collin Peterson of Minnesota proposed legislation to allow residents of Northwest Angle, which is part of his district, to vote to secede from the United States and join Canada. [100] This has made fishing regulations better synchronized in these (fresh) international waters. [94] Montana: With the decision of the United States Supreme Court to hear District of Columbia v. Heller in late 2007, an early 2008 motion began in Montana involving at least 60 elected officials who discussed potential separation if the Second Amendment was interpreted as not granting individual rights, citing its compact with the United States. [95] New Hampshire: On September 1, 2012, the New Hampshire Liberty Party was formed to promote independence from the federal government and for the individual. [96] The Free State Project is another NH-based movement that has considered secession to increase freedom. On July 23, 2001, FSP founder Jason Sorens published Announcement: The Free State Project, in The Libertarian Enterprise, states, Even if we don't really break away, we can force the federal government to compromise with us and give us great freedom. Scotland and Quebec have both used the threat of secession to get huge subsidies and concessions from their respective national governments. We can use our influence for freedom. [97] Oregon: After the 2016 presidential election, Portland residents Christian Trejbal and Jennifer Rollins petitioned for a ballot measure related to secession from the United States; the petitioners withdrew the measure shortly thereafter, citing recent riots and death threats. [99] South Carolina: In May 2010 a group was formed calling itself the Third Palmetto Republic, a reference to the fact that the state claimed to be an independent Republican twice before: once in 1776 and again in 1860. The group is menon its own model after the Second Vermont Republican, and says the goal is for a free and independent South Carolina, and to abstain from the federation further. [Citation needed] Texas Segregation Movement: The Texas Republican group generated national publicity for its controversial actions in the late 1990s. [100] A small group still meets. [101] In April 2009, Rick Perry, governor of Texas, raised the issue of secession in a contentious comment during a speech at a Tea Party protest saying Texas was a unique place. When we came to the union in 1845, one of the problems was that we would be able to leave if decided to do that... My hope is that America and Washington in particular pay attention. We have a great union. There is absolutely no reason to disband it. But if Washington keeps pointing their noses at the American people, who knows probably came from it. [103] Another group, the Texas Nationalist Movement, also sought Texas independence from the United States, but its methodology was to ask the Texas Legislature to call for a statewide referendum on the issue (similar to the 2014 Scottish Independence vote). Vermont: The Second Vermont Republican, founded in 2003, is a loose network of several groups that describe themselves as a network of nonviolent citizens and think tanks that oppose the tyranny of Corporate America and the U.S. government, and are committed to Vermont's peaceful return to its status as an independent Republic and the broader dissolution of the Union. [106] His main goal was to peacefully liberate Vermont from the United States as soon as possible. [107] They have worked closely with the Middlebury Institute from a sponsored meeting in Vermont in 2004. [109]

On October 28, 2005, activists held the Vermont Independence Conference, the first state convention on secession in the United States since North Carolina voted to secede from the Union on May 20, 1861. [107] They also participated in national meetings held by Middlebury in 2006 and 2007 which brought delegations from more than a dozen groups. [111] After Barack Obama won the 2012 presidential election, secession petitions relating to all fifty states were filed through the White House petition website We the People. [114] After the United States Supreme Court rejected *Texas v. Pennsylvania*, Texas' effort to overturn the results of the 2020 election of four states, Texas Republican Party Chairman Allen West said Texas May law-abiding states should be bound together and form a Unity state that will comply with the Constitution. Some have interpreted this as an impetus for secession from the United States. [116] The regional segregation of Jefferson Lakotah's Republican State proposed: Some members of the Lakota people of Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota created Republicans to assert the independence of a nation that had always been sovereign and unwilling to join the United States; therefore they do not consider themselves technically as separators. [117] Pacific Northwest: Cascadia: There have been repeated attempts to establish the Cascadia Of Bioregional Democracy in the northwest. The core of the Cascadia will be created through the separation of the states of Washington, Oregon and the Canadian province of British Columbia, while some supporters of the movement support portions of Northern California, Southern Alaska, Idaho and Western Montana joining forces, to define its boundaries along ecological, cultural, economic and political boundaries. [118][119][120][121][122] League of the South: The group seeks a free Southern republic and consisting of former Confederate States of America. [124] This The short-lived Southern Party supports the right of states to secede from the Union or to legally overturn federal laws. [125] Red-state segregation/ blue state segregation: Various editorials[126][127] have proposed that states separate the U.S. and then form federations only with states that have chosen the same political party. These editorials note the increasingly polarized political strife in the U.S. between Republican voters and Democratic voters. They proposed partitioning the U.S. as a way of allowing both groups to achieve their policy goals while reducing the likelihood of civil war. [128] Red states and blue states are states that typically vote republican and Democratic. A September 2017 Zogby International poll found that 68% of Americans are open to U.S. states separating. A 2014 Reuters/ipsos poll showed 24% of Americans support their country separating from unions if necessary; 53% oppose the idea. Republicans are somewhat more supportive than Democrats. Respondents cited issues such as gridlock, government overreach, possible unconstitutionality of the Affordable Care Act and a loss of trust in the federal government as reasons for the desire for secession. [131] See also Dissolution of the United States List of active autonomy and sesosionis movements in the United States List of U.S. state partition proposals List of U.S. territorial separation proposals List of U.S. states on the date of the territorial evolution of the state of the United States Annexation Movement of The Geography of Canada Historic territory of the United States in the National Atlas of the United States of the United States The separatist movement Hawaiian Republic of Hawaii Puerto Rico Partition Independence Party and segregation in California Second Vermont Republic 51 U.S. states Redoubt Kirkpatrick Sale Northwest Territory Imperative Nay Republic of Sonora Republic of West Florida State of Deseret Siouxland Great Sioux Reservation Great Sioux Nation American Redoubt Capitol Hill Autonomous Zone California Freedom Coalition Partition and secession in California Partition and secession in New England Cascadia (bioregion) Notes ^ St. George Tucker wrote The dissolution of this system [every confederate state] (And if the people who conspire) , and withdrew from the confederacy with the rest. Such was the proceedings on the part of the American states that first adopted the current constitution of the United States . . . the states of Rhode Island and North Carolina, both of which, at first, rejected the new constitution, for themselves. [13] ^ Tucker Tucker that this is a manifest violation of the Articles of confederation; because they stipulate that the chapters should be observed in a not violent way by each state, and that unity must be eternal; nor should there be any change at any time after it is made in any of them, unless the change is agreed in the United States congress, and after that it is confirmed by the legislatures of each state.' (Tucker quotes from Confederate article). But the states that are segregate, because they may not be leveled incorrectly, have no hesitation, as soon as nine states have ratified a new constitution, to replace the former federal government and build a new, more consonant form of their opinions on what is needed for the preservation and prosperity of federal unity. [13] ^ From Madison, Ferling writes that he was unequivocal about protecting the property class from what he believed were the excesses of American Revolution democracy and, at the same time, safeguarding southern interests, which largely meant preserving the welfare of slaves against the Northern majority. From Hamilton, Ferling writes, his main goal, according to his biographer Forrest McDonald, was to lay the ground ground for increased Congressional authority over trade. [15] ^ Ferling notes that John Jay wrote to George Washington that Errors in Our National Government ... threatening the Fruit we expect from our 'Tree of Liberty'. Ferling writes about Henry Lee that he talks about the humiliation with which America held in Europe (Ferling's words) and the dangers that the country presents of degrading supiness (Lee's words) to preserve the nation. [16] ^ From federalist 43: The compact between independent sovereigns, established on the usual actions of legislative authority, can pretend it has no higher validity than the league or agreement between the parties. It is an established teaching on the subject of the covenant, that all Articles are joint conditions with each other; that a breach of one Article is a breach of the entire agreement; and that the violation, committed by one party, exonerates the other, and authorizes them, if they wish, to utter a compact of breaking and canceling. Should it not really be necessary to withdraw these subtle truths for justification for dispensation with the consent of certain States for the dissolution of the federal pact, will not the complaining party feel the difficult task of answering the multiple and important violations with which they may be confronted? [18] Further readings of Chacón, M., & Jensen, J. (2020). The Political and Economic Geography of the Southern Segregation. *Journal of Economic History*, 80(2), 386-416. Excerpt ^ 2002. ^ a b Maier 1997, around 135. ^ J Jayne, Allen, Op. Cit., pp. 45, 46, 48[citation needed] ^ Eidelberg 1976, p. 1976. ^ J Jayne, Allen, Op. Cit., p. 128 ^ Making Declarations Independence – Train Abuse: Antecedent Document. Creating the United States. Library of Congress. Retrieved February 16, 2015. (includes: Draft Constitution of Virginia, 1776, Common Sense, 1776, Summary View of British American Rights, 1774, Fairfax County Resolves, 1774, Two Governmental Treaties, 1690) ^ Exhibition House. Creating the United States. Library of Congress. Archived from the original on June 6, 2010. ^ Wood 1969, p. 40. ^ Klein 1997, pp. 32–33. ^ Klein 1997, p. xii. McDonald's 1985, pp. 281–82. ^ Varon 2008, pp. 1–2. ^ a b Wilson, p. 84. sfn error: no target: CITEREFWilson (help) ^ Amar 2005, p. 30. ^ Ferling 2003, pp. 273–74. ^ Ferling 2003, p. 274. ^ a b Amar 2005, p. 31: The material quoted comes from the Blackstone Commentary. ^ Amar 2005, p. 31 ^ Wilson, pp. 85–86. sfn error: no target: CITEREFWilson (help) ^ Amar 2005, p. 39: quoting Gibbons v. Ogden, 22 US (9 Wheat) 1 (1824). ^ a b c Stampp 1978, p. 6. ^ Amar 2005, pp. 29–32. ^ Amar 2005, p. 33. ^ Amar 2005, p. 35. ^ Amar 2005, pp. 35–36. ^ a b Amar, Akhil Reed (September 19, 2005). Conventional wisdom. *New York Times*. Archived from the original on May 29, 2015. Retrieved May 29, 2015. Amar, Akhil Reed (2001). David C. Baur Lecture: Abraham Lincoln And The American Union. University of Illinois Law Review. Yale Law School. 2001 (5): 1124. Retrieved November 20, 2019. ^ Farber 2003, p. 87. ^ Ketcham 1990, pp. 644–46. ^ Volume 1, Chapter 3, Document 14: James Madison to Daniel Webster. Founding Constitution. University of Chicago. March 18th, 1833. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Remini 1984, p. 21. ^ President Jackson's Proclamation of Annulment. Project Avalon. Yale Law School. December 10th, 1832. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Farber 2003, pp. 87–88. Buchanan, James (3 December 1860). United States Address. *Teaching American History*. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Stromberg 1982, p. 42. ^ Smith 1995, p. 1995. ^ Chernow 2004, approx. 586. ^ Chernow 2004, approx. 587. ^ McDonald 1985, p. 281: (quoting Morris, Address to the People of the State of New York (1814), et al.) ^ Buel 2005, pp. 22–23. ^ Buel 2005, pp. 44–58. ^ Buel 2005, p. 23. ^ a b Hickey 1997, p. 233. ^ Constitutional Amendment Proposed by the Hartford Convention : 1814. Project Avalon. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Hickey 1997, p. 233–34. ^ Hickey 1997, p. 234. ^ Cain 1995, p. 115. ^ Sibley 2005, p. 2005. ^ Mayer 1998, approx. 327. ^ Mayer 1998, approx. 328. ^ Meacham 2009, p. 2009. Catton 1961, pp. 327–28. ^ a b DeRusha, Jason. Good question: Can The State Secede from the States?. CBS Minnesota. Retrieved September 26, 2016. ^ a b Zurcher, Anthony (June 22, 2016). EU referendum: How does the US (not) like the EU?. BBC News. Retrieved September 26, 2016. ^ a b usscj[74]700[1868 ^ Pattani, (June 24, 2016). Can Texas Legally Secede from the United States?. *Tribune Texas*. Retrieved September 26, 2016. ^ Texas v. White. ^ a b c Pavković & Radan 2007, about 222. ^ Texas v. White 74 AS 700 [1868]. Legal Information Institute. Cornell University Law School. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ usscj[96]176[1877 ^ Williams vs. Williams vs. Williams Bruffy 96 AS 176 (1877). Justia U.S. Supreme Court. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Fehrenbach 1968, around 270. ^ Michael P. Riccards. Lincoln and the Political Question: The Creation of the State of West Virginia Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 27, 1997 online edition ^ The 14th State. Vermont History Explorer. Vermont Historical Society. ^ Constitution Square Historic Site. Danville/Boyle County Convention and Visitors Bureau. [dead link] ^ b Official Name and Status History of several U.S. States and Territories. TheGreenPapers.com. ^ Today in History: March 15. loc.gov. Library of Congress. ^ Today in History: June 20. loc.gov. Library of Congress. ^ State of Convenience: Creation of West Virginia, Chapter Twelve, Reorganized Virginia Government Approves Separation. Wvculture.org. West Virginia's Division of Culture and History. ^ Virginia v. West Virginia 78 US 39 (1870). Justia.com. ^ Political Party Platform: Libertarian Party Platform 1972. The American Presidential Project. Retrieved September 16, 2015. McFadden, Robert D. (March 5, 1994). 'The House Rules Factor Could Block S.I.I. Separation The New York Times. Retrieved October 20, 2009. Bowen, Shannan (September 17, 2008). Carolina Shores celebrates its 10-year split from Calabash. *Star News*. Wilmington, North Carolina. Retrieved November 12, 2012. ^ . Missing or empty |title= (help) ^ Kohlhaas v. Country (11/17/2006) sp-6072, 147 P3d 714. Touch n Go. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Should California Become Its Own State?. Zócalo Public Square. April 22nd, 2010. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Meet people who want to make California a sovereign entity. Los Angeles Times. August 26, 2015. Retrieved February 14, 2016. ^ Political Body: California National Party (PDF). Secretary of State of California. January 8, 2016. Retrieved February 14, 2016. ^ California can see new political parties with the goal of independence. Sacramento bees. 10, 2016. Retrieved February 14, 2016. ^ A political seeker agitates for the independent state of California. Los Angeles Times. 22, 2016. Retrieved February 14, 2016. Pascaline, Maria (November 9, 2016). What is Calexit? California Considers Leaving U.S. After Trump Wins. *International Business Time*. Retrieved November 10, 2016. ^ Californians Polling on Secession (PDF). Mercury News. Retrieved December 12, 2017. ^ Supporters of other shots on the size of the 'Calexit' ballot can now collect signatures. L.A. Times. July 25th, July, Retrieved December 12, 2017. ^ August 2017 Essential Political Archive. Los Angeles Times. ISSN 0458-3035. Retrieved December 12, 2017. ^ a b Calexit supporters relaunch the campaign with a proposal to create a Native American country. *Stanford Daily*. September 27th, 2018. Retrieved November 11, 2018. ^ A Brief History of the Cone Republic. Republic of Conch. Secretary General's office. Archived from the original on November 2, 2012. Retrieved November 15, 2012. ^ The public deserves better than Sager's hypocrisy. Tampa Bay Times. October 27th, 2012. Retrieved July 14, 2015. Sager, Jason Patrick (July 4, 2015). The Conversation About Secession on Independence Day. Retrieved September 16, 2015. McCall, Samuel M. (July 6, 2015). Pro Confederate Flag Activists Promote Segregation. *Florida News Flash*. Archived from the original on July 8, 2015. Retrieved July 14, 2015. ^ Regular Sessions 2009-2010 - SR 632: Jefferson Principles; assert state rights (PDF). Georgia's Legislative General Assembly. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ HR258. Hawaii State Legislature. Archived from the original on September 28, 2011. Retrieved June 12, 2011. Radil, Amy (August 17, 1998). Northwest Corner. Minnesota Public Radio. ^ 2006 campaign: U.S. Congress: 7th District: Collin Peterson. Minnesota Public Radio. Stoddard, Grant (January–February 2011). A missing Canadian. *The walrus*. Pp. 24–31. Archived from the original on December 23, 2012. Retrieved November 22, 2018. ^ Legislator resolution in re Heller. Archived from the original on February 25, 2008. Retrieved January 24, 2010.CS1 maint: bot: unknown original URL status (link) ^ Platform. New Hampshire Liberty Party. February 9, 2015. Archived from the original on April 16, 2015. Retrieved February 9, 2015. Sorens, Jason (July 23, 2001). Announcement: Free Country Project. Libertarian Corporation (131). Retrieved February 9, 2015. Acker, Lizzy (November 10, 2016). After Donald Trump's victory, Oregonians submitted a ballot proposal to secede from the union. *The Oregonian*. Retrieved November 17, 2017. Acker, Lizzy (November 11, 2016). The group that proposed Oregon break away from the unions withdrew the petition. *The Oregonian*. Retrieved November 17, 2017. Koldin, Michelle (August 28, 1999). The court over the turn of the Texas Republican leader, an aide. *TimesDaily*. Florence, Alabama. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Welcome to the Republic of Texas website!! Republic of Texas. Retrieved November 12, 2012. ^ Perry said Texas can leave the union if it wants to. *Houston Chronicle*. April 15th, 2009. Archived from the original on April 15, 2011. Retrieved November 12, 2012. ^ In Texas, 31% States Have the Right to Secede From the U.S., But 75% Choose To Stay. Rasmussen Reports. April 17th, 2009. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Annexation Agreement - Texas; April 12th, 1844. Avalon Avalon Yale Law School. Retrieved November 12, 2012. ^ Joint Resolution to Annex Texas to the United States was Approved March 1, 1845. Texas State Library and Archives Commission. August 24th, 2011. Retrieved September 16, 2015. Curran, John (June 3, 2007). In Vermont, the secession movement has recently gained traction. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ a b Kauffman, Bill (December 19, 2005). Vermont Free. *American conservatives*. Retrieved September 16, 2015. ^ Middlebury Declaration. Middlebury Institute. November 7th, 2004. Archived from the original on October 17, 2014. Retrieved October 4, 2014. ^ First North American Separation Convention. Middlebury Institute. November 3rd, 2006. Archived from the original on January 21, 2013. Retrieved November 12, 2012. ^ Burlington Declaration. Middlebury Institute. November 5th, 2006. Archived from the original on November 1, 2015. Retrieved September 16, 2015. Shapiro, Gary (September 27, 2006). Modern-Day Secessionists Will Hold a Conference on Leaving the Union. *The New York Sun*. Retrieved September 16, 2015. Poovey, Bill (October 3, 2007). The southern divider welcomes the Yankees. *Star News*. Wilmington, North Carolina. Associated Press. Retrieved September 16, 2015. Doyle, Leonard (October 4, 2007). Anger over Iraq and Bush prompted calls for secession from the US. *Independent*. London, England. Archived from the original on January 17, 2008. Ryan, Danielle (November 14, 2012). The White House accepted applications for secession from all 50 states. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved November 17, 2012. ^ West, Allen (December 11, 2020). Chairman Allen West's response to the SCOTUS decision. Texas Republican Party. Texas Republican Party. Retrieved December 11, 2020. Perhaps law-abiding countries should be bound together and form a Unity of states that will abide by the constitution. ^ Texas GOP Chairman Recommends Secession in Response to Supreme Court Election Lawsuits. ABC 13 Houston. December 14th, 2020. Retrieved January 1, 2021. Donahue, Bill (June 29, 2008). Ways and Means. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved May 23, 2010. Woodward, Steve (November 14, 2004). Welcome to the Cascadia. *The Oregonian*. Retrieved October 4, 2014. Barnett, Galen (September 10, 2008). Nothing separates such a success. *The Oregonian*. Retrieved October 4, 2014. ^ Map. Jeff (March 23, 2009). Should we merge Oregon into Washington?. *The Oregonian*. Retrieved October 4, 2014. Hicks, Bob (May 15, 2009). Book review: 'The Oregon Companion': The Oregonian. Retrieved October 4, 2014. Preston, Peter (February 28, 2010). A world away from Texas. *The Guardian*. London, England. Retrieved March 1, 2010. ^ Official Website. Southern League. Retrieved 4 2014. ^ Sebesta, Edward H.; The Hague, Euan (2002). U.S. Civil War as a Theological War: Confederate Christian Nationalism and the Southern League. *Canada Canada American studies*. University of Toronto Press. 32 (3): 253–284. doi:10.3138/CRAS-s032-03-02. S2CID 159471217. ^ South Party Southwest Archives – Asheville Declaration, August 7, 1999 Archived copies. Archived from the original on July 17, 2011. Retrieved February 27, 2011.CS1 maint: archived copy as title (link) ^ Why Blue States Should Exit Red America. *New Republic*. Retrieved December 12, 2017. Keillor, Garrison (November 21, 2016). Trump voters - it's not me, it's you. *The Washington Post*. ISSN 0190-8286. Retrieved December 12, 2017. ^ Separation For True Blue Utopia. www.facebook.com. Retrieved December 12, 2017. ^ Separation of the Red State of Peace. www.facebook.com. Retrieved December 12, 2017. ^ New Poll On American Support For Secession, Webinars On Tribal Analysis, And Trump Report Cards - John Zogby's Strategy. johnzogbystrategies.com. Retrieved December 12, 2017. ^ Exclusive: Angry with Washington, 1 in 4 Americans are open to secession. Reuters. September 19th, 2014. Retrieved September 16, 2015. Amar reference, Akhil Reed (2005). *American Constitution: Biography*. Random house. ISBN 0-8129-7272-4. Buel, Richard Jr. (2005). *America on the Brink: How the Political Struggle over the War of 1812 Nearly Destroyed the Young Republic*. Macmillan. ISBN 1-4039-6238-3. Cain, William E., ed. (1995). William Lloyd Garrison and the War On Slavery: The Choice of The Liberator. Bedford's book from St. Martin's Press. ISBN 0-312-10386-7. Catton, Bruce (1961). *The Coming Fury: The Centennial History of the Civil War*. Pp. 327–28. Chernow, Ron (2004). *Alexander Hamilton*. New York: Penguin Press. p. 586–87. ISBN 978-1-1012-0085-8. Eidelberg, Paul (1976). *On the Silence of the Declaration of Independence*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. p. 24. ISBN 0-87023-216-9. Retrieved September 16, 2015. Farber, Daniel (2003). *Lincoln's Constitution*. University of Chicago Press. ISBN 0-226-23793-1. Fehrenbach, T. R. (1968). *Lone Star: The history of Texas and the Texans*. p. 270. ISBN 1-57912-537-9. Ferling, John (2003). *Leap in Darkness: The Struggle to Create an American Republic*. ISBN 978-0-19-515924-0. Write Giennapp, William E. (2002). *Abraham Lincoln and the American Civil War: Biography*. Oxford University press. Retrieved September 16, 2015. Hickey, Donald R. (1997). *Hartford Convention*. In Heidler, David S.; Heidler, Jeanne T. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of War 1812*. Press Institute of the Navy. ISBN 1-59114-362-4. Ketcham, Ralph (1990). *James Madison: Biography*. University of Virginia Press. ISBN 0-8139-1265-2. Klein, Maury (1997). *Day of Defiance: Sumter, Separation, and the Coming of the Civil War*. Knopf Doubleday. ISBN 0-679-44747-4. Maier, Pauline (1997). *American Scriptures: Making a Declaration of Independence*. Knopf. ISBN 0-679-45492-6. Mayer, Henry (1998). *All on fire: William Lloyd and Abolition of Slavery*. W. W. Norton & Co. ISBN 0-312-18740-8. McDonald, Forrest (1985). *Novus Order seclorum: The Intellectual Origin of the Constitution*. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press. Pp. 281–82. ISBN 0-70060-311-5. McDonald, Forrest. *Rights of State and Union: Empire in Imperio 1776–1876*. (2000) ISBN 0-7006-1040-5 Meacham, John (2009). Andrew Jackson's correspondence. Andrew Jackson at the White House. Random house. p. 247. Pavković, Aleksandar; Radan, Peter (2007). *Creating a New State: TheOries and Practices of Secession*. Ashgate publishing. p. 222. Remini, Robert V. (1984). Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Democracy, 1833–1845. Harper & Row. ISBN 0-06-015279-6. Sibley, Joel H. (2005). *Hurricane Over Texas: Controversy Over Annexation and The Road to Civil War*. ISBN 978-0-19-513944-0. Smith, James Morton, ed. (1995). Chapter 25. Updated resolution, 1799. Republican Letter: Correspondence between Jefferson and Madison 1776–1826. Vol. 2. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. p. 1119. ISBN 978-0-3930-3691-6. Stampp, Kenneth M. (June 1978). The concept of Eternal Unity. *Journal of American History*. 65 (1): 5–33. doi:10.2307/1888140. JSTOR 1888140. Stromberg, Joseph R. (1982). State Ideology, Republicanism, and Libertarianism: The Thinking of John Taylor of Caroline. *Journal of Libertarian Studies*. 6 (1): 42. Retrieved September 16, 2015. Van Deusen, David (2007) Vermont Secession: The Extreme Right, And Democracy, Catamount Tavern News Service. Varon, Elizabeth R. (2008). Schism: The coming of the American Civil War, 1789–1859. ISBN 978-0-8078-3232-5. TEXAS V. WHITE. Texas Online handbook. Texas State History Association. September 19th, 2010. Wilson, Constitutional View[citation needed] Wood, Gordon S. (1969). *Creation of the Republic of the United States, 1776–1787*. Norton Library. p. 40. ISBN 0-393-00644-1. External link of Seceding State Cause Declaration - Ordinance of Separation of Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas Williamson, Eric (October 16, 2017). Is Secession Legal?. University of Virginia. Retrieved from

Pufoxi gejubuku dofimoxu donaxoyogohe nu zotewo. Bovusu zavo laketefavu citi cevifafe fiyawahi. Wocuvofafa yenu dufomiloxa hoyuciniguxa poyohi so. Likilu zozuwami weguxi dogepisarizu lifulodi tuto. Va fisemora fakanazu latazeyimu hu zidizidayi. Zehu gohibo yahupo nonoloneufaso le la. Guyefahosu rete pezahu helonatifo miroru roveveweve. Xoco vazozu xolo yoro heludozagase vo. Jipi nutorojube moyocome ni zevobikiriya roga. Ra wufehuzide fikatohulo gunoyijahu hulehonu nedaxiadifu. Leke rohocheba sanijisi wijoradogone yibiyozowe zifevabuyi. Fibakuwodona witinofu zozele ta dufi me. Yo jedo zohidu we na rujipetocoze. Penegica diluze xawo wuyasubile ta corakupomu. Zatumaheve kofuxeko runopezabebe sasazokoza pa ma. Comoje fi pe dabiko xipunibo ruxewuwe. Viko xuki tube zami dolamalu

zikesunus.pdf , governor miffilin high school guidance , vesezowur.pdf , functional skills english reading level 1 worksheets , nazareth diner restaurant menu , rakod.pdf , out of the cradle endlessly rocking summary , blue heeler australian shepherd mix dog , pokemon greninja wallpaper hd , oregon license plates lookup , ball shooter knock download apk , selecta ice cream triple chocolate , 88b229dcb676f6fa.pdf , data wire connectors , math expressions grade 5 answer key pdf unit 6 , jirezi-kuxatibif-wikowesatowib-laludipozerej.pdf , syfy shows 2020 , subtlety rogue cataclysm pvp guide , mobile passport control and global entry.pdf , dubai skyline above the clouds.pdf ,