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With the Civil War, the planters died as a class. We still talk as though the dominant social class in the South persisted after the war. But it did not. It disappeared. Just how quickly and in what manner the transformation was made, we do not know. No scientific study of the submergence of the remainder of the planter class into the ranks of the poor whites, and the corresponding rise of a portion of the poor whites into the dominant portion of landholders and capitalists, has been made. Of the names of prominent Southern families in Congress in 1860, only two appear in 1870, five in 1880. Of 90 prominent names in 1870, only four survived in 1880. Men talk today as though the upper class in the white South is descended from the slaveholders; yet we know by plain mathematics that the ancestors of most of the present Southerners never owned a slave nor had any real economic part in slavery. The disaster of war decimated the planters; the bitter disappointment and frustration led to a tremendous mortality after the war, and from 1870 on the planter class merged their blood so completely with the rising poor whites that they disappeared as a separate aristocracy. It is this that explains so many characteristics of the post-war South: its lynching and mob law, its murders and cruelty, its insensibility to the finer things of civilization.

Not spring; from us no agony of birth
Is asked or needed; in a crimson tide
Upon the down-slope of the world
We, the elect, are hurled
In fearful power and brief pride
Burning at last to silence and dark earth.
Not Spring.  

*Quoted in speech of Charles Sumner, in the United States Senate, December 20, 1859, from "a private letter which I have received from a government officer." Congressional Globe, 36th Congress, 1st Session, p. 93, Column a.
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IV. THE GENERAL STRIKE

How the Civil War meant emancipation and how the black worker won the war by a general strike which transferred his labor from the Confederate planter to the Northern invader, in whose army lines workers began to be organized as a new labor force.

When Edwin Ruffin, white-haired and mad, fired the first gun at Fort Sumter, he freed the slaves. It was the last thing he meant to do but that was because he was so typically a Southern oligarch. He did not know the real world about him. He was provincial and lived apart on his plantation with his servants, his books and his thoughts. Outside of agriculture, he jumped at conclusions instead of testing them by careful research. He knew, for instance, that the North would not fight. He knew that Negroes would never revolt.

And so war came. War is murder, force, anarchy and debt. Its end is evil, despite all incidental good. Neither North nor South had before 1861 the slightest intention of going to war. The thought was in many respects ridiculous. They were not prepared for war. The national army was small, poorly equipped and without experience. There was no file from which someone might draw plans of subjugation.

When Northern armies entered the South they became armies of emancipation. It was the last thing they planned to be. The North did not propose to attack property. It did not propose to free slaves. This was to be a white man's war to preserve the Union, and the Union must be preserved.

Nothing that concerned the amelioration of the Negro touched the heart of the mass of Americans nor could the common run of men realize the political and economic cost of Negro slavery. When, therefore, the Southern radicals, backed by political oligarchy and economic dictatorship in the most extreme form in which the world had seen it for five hundred years, precipitated secession, that part of the North that opposed the plan had to hunt for a rallying slogan to unite the majority in the North and in the West, and if possible, bring the Border States into an opposing phalanx.

Freedom for slaves furnished no such slogan. Not one-tenth of the Northern white population would have fought for any such purpose. Free soil was a much stronger motive, but it had no cogency in this
expected action on the part of the Negro, but how much, they could not say. Only John Brown knew just how revolt had come and would come and he was dead.

Thus the Negro himself was not seriously considered by the majority of men, North or South. And yet from the very beginning, the Negro occupied the center of the stage because of very simple physical reasons: the war was in the South and in the South were 3,953,740 black slaves and 261,918 free Negroes. What was to be the relation of this mass of workers to the war? What did the war mean to the Negroes, and what did the Negroes mean to the war? There are two theories, both rather over-elaborated: the one that the Negro did nothing but faithfully serve his master until emancipation was thrust upon him; the other that the Negro immediately, just as quickly as the presence of Northern soldiers made it possible, left servitude and took his stand with the army of freedom.

It must be borne in mind that nine-tenths of the four million black slaves could neither read nor write, and that the overwhelming majority of them were isolated on country plantations. Any mass movement under such circumstances must materialize slowly and painfully. What the Negro did was to wait, look and listen and try to see where his interest lay. There was no use in seeking refuge in an army which was not an army of freedom; and there was no sense in revolting against armed masters who were conquering the world. As soon, however, as it became clear that the Union armies would not or could not return fugitive slaves, and that the masters with all their fumes and fury were uncertain of victory, the slave entered upon a general strike against slavery by the same methods that he had used during the period of the fugitive slave. He ran away to the first place of safety and offered his services to the Federal Army. So that in this way it was really true that he served his former master and served the emancipating army; and it was also true that this withdrawal and bestowal of his labor decided the war.

The South counted on Negroes as laborers to raise food and money crops for civilians and for the army, and even in a crisis, to be used for military purposes. Slave revolt was an ever-present risk, but there was no reason to think that a short war with the North would greatly increase this danger. Publicly, the South repudiated the thought of its slaves even wanting to be rescued. The New Orleans Crescent showed "the absurdity of the assertion of a general stampede of our Negroes." The London Dispatch was convinced that Negroes did not want to be free. "As for the slaves themselves, crushed with the wrongs of Dred Scott and Uncle Tom—most provoking—they cannot be brought to burn with revenge." They are spies for their masters. They obstinately
refuse to run away to liberty, outrage and starvation. They work in
the fields as usual when the planter and overseer are away and only
the white women are left at home.

Early in the war, the South had made careful calculation of the
military value of slaves. The Alabama Advertiser in 1861 discussed
the slaves as a "Military Element in the South." It said that "The total
white population of the eleven states now comprising the Confederacy
is 5,000,000, and, therefore, to fill up the ranks of the proposed army,
600,000, about ten per cent of the entire white population, will be
required. In any other country than our own such a draft could not be
met, but the Southern states can furnish that number of men, and still
not leave the material interest of the country in a suffering condition."

The editor, with fatuous faith, did not for a moment contemplate
any mass movement against this program on the part of the slaves.
"Those who are incapacitated for bearing arms can oversee the plant-
tations, and the Negroes can go undisturbed in their usual labors.
In the North, the case is different; the men who join the army of
subjugation are the laborers, the producers and the factory operatives.
Nearly every man from that section, especially those from the rural
districts, leaves some branch of industry to suffer during his absence.
The institution of slavery in the South alone enables her to place in
the field a force much larger in proportion to her white population
than the North, or indeed any country which is dependent entirely
on free labor. The institution is a tower of strength to the South, par-
cularly at the present crisis, and our enemies will be likely to find
that the 'Moral Cancer' about which their orators are so fond of prating,
is really one of the most effective weapons employed against the
Union by the South."

Soon the South of necessity was moving out beyond this plan. It
was no longer simply a question of using the Negroes at home on the
plantation to raise food. They could be of even more immediate use,
as military labor, to throw up breastworks, transport and prepare food
and act as servants in camp. In the Charleston Courier of November
22, able-bodied hands were asked to be sent by their masters to work
upon the defenses. "They would be fed and properly cared for."

In 1863, in Charleston, after a proclamation of martial law, the gov-
ernor and counsel authorized the procuring of Negro slaves either by
the planter's consent or by impressment "to work on the fortifications
and defenses of Charleston harbor."

In Mississippi in 1862, permission was granted the Governor to im-
press slaves to work in New Iberia for salt, which was becoming the
Confederacy's most pressing necessity. In Texas, a thousand Negroes
were offered by planters for work on the public defenses.

By 1864, the matter had passed beyond the demand for slaves as
military laborers and had come to the place where the South was seri-
ously considering and openly demanding the use of Negroes as sol-
diers. Distinctly and inevitably, the rigor of the slave system in the
South softened as war proceeded. Slavery showed in many if not all
respects its best side. The harshness and the cruelty, in part, had to
disappear, since there were left on the plantations mainly women and
children, with only a few men, and there was a certain feeling and
apprehension in the air on the part of the whites which led them to
capitalize all the friendship and kindness which had existed between
them and the slaves. No race could have responded to this so quickly
and thoroughly as the Negroes. They felt pity and responsibility and
also a certain new undercurrent of independence. Negroes were still
being sold rather ostentatiously in Charleston and New Orleans, but
the long lines of Virginia Negroes were not marching to the South-
west. In a certain sense, after the first few months everybody knew
that slavery was done with; that no matter who won, the condition of
the slave could never be the same after this disaster of war. And it
was, perhaps, these considerations, more than anything else, that held
the poised arm of the black man; for no one knew better than the
South what a Negro craved with cruelty and oppression and beaten
back to the last stand could do to his oppressor.

The Southerners, therefore, were careful. Those who had been kind
to their slaves assured them of the bad character of the Yankee and of
their own good intentions.

Thus while the Negroes knew there were Abolitionists in the North,
they did not know their growth, their power or their intentions and
they did hear on every side that the South was overwhelmingly vic-
torious on the battlefield. On the other hand, some of the Negroes
sensed what was beginning to happen. The Negroes of the cities, the
Negroes who were being hired out, the Negroes of intelligence who
could read and write, all began carefully to watch the unfolding of
the situation. At the first gun of Sumter, the black mass began not to
move but to heave with nervous tension and watchful waiting. Even
before war was declared, a movement began across the border. Just
before the war large numbers of fugitive slaves and free Negroes
rushed into the North. It was estimated that two thousand left North
Carolina alone because of rumors of war.

When W. T. Sherman occupied Port Royal in October, 1861, he
had no idea that he was beginning emancipation at one of its strategic
points. On the contrary, he was very polite and said that he had no
idea of interfering with slaves. In the same way, Major General Dix,
on seizing two counties of Virginia, was careful to order that slavery
was not to be interfered with or slaves to be received into the line. Burnside went further, and as he brought his Rhode Island regiment through Baltimore in June, he courteously returned two Negroes who tried to run away with him. They were "supposed to be slaves," although they may have been free Negroes. On the 4th of July, Colonel Pryor of Ohio delivered an address to the people of Virginia in which he repudiated the accusation that the Northern army were Abolitionists.

"I desire to assure you that the relation of master and servant as recognized in your state shall be respected. Your authority over that species of property shall not in the least be interfered with. To this end, I assure you that those under my command have peremptory orders to take up and hold any Negroes found running about the camp without passes from their masters." 3

Halleck in Missouri in 1862 refused to let fugitive slaves enter his lines. Burnside, Buell, Hooker, Thomas Williams and McClellan himself, all warned their soldiers against receiving slaves and most of them permitted masters to come and remove slaves found within the lines.

The constant charge of Southern newspapers, Southern politicians and their Northern sympathizers, that the war was an abolition war, met with constant and indignant denial. Loyal newspapers, orators and preachers, with few exceptions, while advocating stringent measures for putting down the Rebellion, carefully disclaimed any intention of disturbing the "peculiar institution" of the South. The Secretary of State informed foreign governments, through our ministers abroad, that this was not our purpose. President Lincoln, in his earlier messages, substantially reiterated the statement. Leading generals, on entering Southern territory, issued proclamations to the same effect. One even promised to put down any slave insurrection "with an iron hand," while others took vigorous measures to send back the fugitives who sought refuge within their lines.

"In the early years of the war, if accounts do not err, during the entire period McClellan commanded the Army of the Potomac, 'John Brown's Body' was a forbidden air among the regimental bands. The Hutchisons were driven from Union camps for singing abolition songs, and in so far as the Northern army interested itself at all in the slavery question, it was by the use of force to return to their Southern masters fugitives seeking shelter in the Union lines. While the information they possessed, especially respecting the roads and means of communication, should have been of inestimable service to the Federals, they were not to be employed as laborers or armed as soldiers. The North avoided the appearance of a desire to raise the Negroes from the plane of chattels to the rank of human beings." 4

---
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Here was no bid for the cooperation of either slaves or free Negroes. In the North, Negroes were not allowed to enlist and often refused with indignation. "Thus the weakness of the South temporarily became her strength. Her servile population, repulsed by Northern pro-slavery sentiment, remained at home engaged in agriculture, thus releasing her entire white population for active service in the field; while, on the other hand, the military resources of the North were necessarily diminished by the demands of labor." 4

It was as Frederick Douglass said in Boston in 1865, that the Civil War was begun "in the interests of slavery on both sides. The South was fighting to take slavery out of the Union, and the North fighting to keep it in the Union; the South fighting to get it beyond the limits of the United States Constitution, and the North fighting for the old guarantees;—both despising the Negro, both insulting the Negro."

It was, therefore, at first by no means clear to most of the four million Negroes in slavery what this war might mean to them. They crouched consciously and moved silently, listening, hoping and hesitating. The watchfulness of the South was redoubled. They spread propaganda: the Yankees were not only not thinking of setting them free, but if they did anything, they would sell them into worse slavery in the West Indies. They would drive them from even the scant comfort of the plantations into the highways and purlieus. Moreover, if they tried to emancipate the slaves, they would fail because they could not do this without conquest of the South. The South was unconquerable.

The South was not slow to spread propaganda and point to the wretched condition of fugitive Negroes in order to keep the loyalty of its indispensable labor force. The Charleston Daily Courier said February 18, 1863: "A company of volunteers having left Fayette County for the field of action, Mr. Nance sent two Negro boys along to aid the company. Their imaginations became dazzled with the visions of Elysian fields in Yankeedom and they went to find them. But Paradise was nowhere there, and they again sighed for home. The Yanks, however, detained them and cut off their ears close to their heads. These Negroes finally made their escape and are now at home with Mr. Nance in Pickens. They are violent haters of Yankees and their adventures and experiences are a terror to Negroes of the region, who learned a lesson from their brethren whose ears are left in Lincolndom."

The Charleston Mercury, May 8, 1862, said: "The Yankees are fortifying Fernandina (Florida) and have a large number of Negroes engaged on their works. Whenever the Negroes have an opportunity,
used the soldiers for recapturing them. This was all well enough, as long as the war was a dress parade. But when it became real war, and slaves were captured or received, they could be used as much-needed laborers and servants by the Northern army.

This but emphasized and made clearer a truth which ought to have been recognized from the very beginning: the Southern worker, black and white, held the key to the war; and of the two groups, the black worker raising food and raw materials held an even more strategic place than the white. This was so clear a fact that both sides should have known it. Fremont in Missouri took the logical action of freeing slaves of the enemy round about him by proclamation, and President Lincoln just as promptly repudiated what he had done. Even before that, General Butler in Virginia, commander of the Union forces at Fortress Monroe, met three slaves walking into his camp from the Confederate fortifications where they had been at work. Butler immediately declared these men “contraband of war” and put them to work in his own camp. More slaves followed, accompanied by their wives and children. The situation here was not quite so logical. Nevertheless, Butler kept the fugitives and freed them and let them do what work they could; and his action was approved by the Secretary of War.

“On May twenty-sixth, only two days after the one slave appeared before Butler, eight Negroes appeared; on the next day, forty-seven, of all ages and both sexes. Each day they continued to come by twenties, thirties and forties until by July 30th the number had reached nine hundred. In a very short while the number ran up into the thousands. The renowned Fortress took the name of the ‘freedom fort’ to which the blacks came by means of a ‘mysterious spiritual telegraph.’”

In December, 1861, the Secretary of the Treasury, Simon Cameron, had written, printed and put into the mails his first report as Secretary of War without consultation with the President. Possibly he knew that his recommendations would not be approved, but “he recommended the general arming of Negroes, declaring that the Federals had as clear a right to employ slaves taken from the enemy as to use captured gunpowder.” This report was recalled by the President by telegraph and the statements of the Secretary were modified. The incident aroused some unpleasantness in the cabinet.

The published report finally said:

“Persons held by rebels, under such laws, to service as slaves, may, however, be justly liberated from their constraint, and made more valuable in various employments, through voluntary and compensated service, than if confiscated as subjects of property.”

Transforming itself suddenly from a problem of abandoned plan-
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Illegitimate birth in consequence of slavery, left a great number of children practically in a state of orphanage." 7

This was the beginning of the swarming of the slaves, of the quiet but unswerving determination of increasing numbers no longer to work on Confederate plantations, and to seek the freedom of the Northern armies. Wherever the army marched and in spite of all obstacles came the rising tide of slaves seeking freedom. For a long time, their treatment was left largely to the discretion of the department managers; some welcomed them, some drove them away, some organized them for work. Gradually, the fugitives became organized and formed a great labor force for the army. Several thousand were employed as laborers, servants, and spies.

A special war correspondent of the New York Tribune writes: "God bless the Negroes," say I, with earnest lips. During our entire captivity, and after our escape, they were ever our firm, brave, unflinching friends. We never made an appeal to them, they did not answer. They never hesitated to do us a service at the risk even of life, and under the most trying circumstances revealed a devotion and a spirit of self-sacrifice that was heroic. The magic word 'Yankee' opened all their hearts, and elicited the loftiest virtues. They were ignorant, oppressed, enslaved; but they always cherished a simple and a beautiful faith in the cause of the Union and its ultimate triumph, and never abandoned or turned aside from a man who sought food or shelter on his way to Freedom." 8

This whole move was not dramatic or hysterical, rather it was like the great unbroken swell of the ocean before it dashes on the reefs. The Negroes showed no disposition to strike the one terrible blow which brought black men freedom in Haiti and which in all history has been used by all slaves and justified. There were some plans for insurrection made by Union officers:

"The plan is to induce the blacks to make a simultaneous movement of rising, on the night of the 1st of August next, over the entire States in rebellion, to arm themselves with any and every kind of weapon that may come to hand, and commence operations by burning all the railroad and country bridges, and tear up railroad tracks, and to destroy telegraph lines, etc., and then take to the woods, swamps, or the mountains, where they may emerge as occasion may offer for provisions and for further depredations. No blood is to be shed except in self-defense. The corn will be ripe about the 1st of August and with this and hogs running in the woods, and by foraging upon the plantations by night, they can subsist. This is the plan in substance, and if we can obtain a concerted movement at the time named it will doubtless be successful."

Rude barracks were erected at different points for the temporary shelter of the freedmen; but as soon as possible the colonies thus formed were broken up and the people encouraged to make individual contracts for labor upon neighboring plantations. In connection with the colonies, farms were cultivated which aided to meet the expenses. Hospitals were established at various points for the sick, of whom there were great numbers. The separation of families by the war, and
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Such plans came to naught for the simple reason that there was an easier way involving freedom with less risk.

The South preened itself on the absence of slave violence. Governor Walker of Florida said in his inaugural in 1865: "Where, in all the records of the past, does history present such an instance of steadfast devotion, unwavering attachment and constancy as was exhibited by the slaves of the South throughout the fearful contest that has just ended? The country invaded, homes desolated, the master absent in the army or forced to seek safety in flight and leave the mistress and her helpless infants unprotected, with every incitement to insubordination and instigation, to rape and murder, no instance of insurrection, and scarcely one of voluntary desertion has been recorded."

The changes upon this theme have been rung by Southern orators many times since. The statement, of course, is not quite true. Hundreds of thousands of slaves were very evidently leaving their masters' homes and plantations. They did not wreak vengeance on unprotected women. They found an easier, more effective and more decent way to freedom. Men go wild and fight for freedom with bestial ferocity when they must—where there is no other way; but human nature does not deliberately choose blood—at least not black human nature. On the other hand, for every slave that escaped to the Union army, there were ten left on the untouched and inaccessible plantations.

Another step was logical and inevitable. The men who handled a spade for the Northern armies, the men who fed them, and as spies brought in information, could also handle a gun and shoot. Without legal authority and in spite of it, suddenly the Negro became a soldier. Later his services as soldier were not only permitted but were demanded to replace the tired and rebellious white men of the North. But as a soldier, the Negro must be free.

The North started out with the idea of fighting the war without touching slavery. They faced the fact, after severe fighting, that Negroes seemed a valuable asset as laborers, and they therefore declared them "contraband of war." It was but a step from that to attract and induce Negro labor to help the Northern armies. Slaves were urged and invited into the Northern armies; they became military laborers and spies; not simply military laborers, but laborers on the plantations, where the crops went to help the Federal army or were sold North. Thus wherever Northern armies appeared, Negro laborers came, and the North found itself actually freeing slaves before it had the slightest intention of doing so, indeed when it had every intention not to.

The experience of the army with the refugees and the rise of the departments of Negro affairs were a most interesting, but unfortunately little studied, phase of Reconstruction. Yet it contained in a

sense the key to the understanding of the whole situation. At first, the rush of the Negroes from the plantations came as a surprise and was variously interpreted. The easiest thing to say was that Negroes were tired of work and wanted to live at the expense of the government; wanted to travel and see things and places. But in contradiction to this was the extent of the movement and the terrible suffering of the refugees. If they were seeking peace and quiet, they were much better off on the plantations than trudging in the footsteps of the army or squatting miserably in the camps. They were mistreated by the soldiers; ridiculed; driven away, and yet they came. They increased with every campaign, and as a final gesture, they marched with Sherman from Atlanta to the sea, and met the refugees and abandoned human property on the Sea Islands and the Carolina Coast.

This was not merely the desire to stop work. It was a strike on a wide basis against the conditions of work. It was a general strike that involved directly in the end perhaps a half million people. They wanted to stop the economy of the plantation system, and to do that they left the plantations. At first, the commanders were disposed to drive them away, or to give them quasi-freedom and let them do as they pleased with the nothing that they possessed. This did not work. Then the commanders organized relief and afterward, work. This came to the attention of the country first in Pierce's "Ten Thousand Clients." Pierce of Boston had worked with the refugees in Virginia under Butler, provided them with food and places to live, and given them jobs and land to cultivate. He was successful. He came from there, and, in conjunction with the Treasury Department, began the work on a wider scale at Port Royal. Here he found the key to the situation. The Negroes were willing to work and did work, but they wanted land to work, and they wanted to see and own the results of their toil.

It was here and in the West and the South that a new vista opened. Here was a chance to establish an agrarian democracy in the South; peasant holders of small properties, eager to work and raise crops, amenable to suggestion and general direction. All they needed was honesty in treatment, and education. Wherever these conditions were fulfilled, the result was little less than phenomenal. This was testified to by Pierce in the Carolinas, by Butler's agents in North Carolina, by the experiment of the Sea Islands, by Grant's department of Negro affairs under Eaton, and by Banks' direction of Negro labor in Louisiana. It is astonishing how this army of striking labor furnished in time 200,000 Federal soldiers whose evident ability to fight decided the war.

General Butler went from Virginia to New Orleans to take charge of the city newly captured in April, 1862. Here was a whole city half-
filled with blacks and mulattoes, some of them wealthy free Negroes and soldiers who came over from the Confederate side and joined the Federals.

Perhaps the greatest and most systematic organizing of fugitives took place in New Orleans. At first, Butler had issued orders that no slaves would be received in New Orleans. Many planters were unable to make slaves work or to support them, and sent them back of the Federal lines, planning to reclaim them after the war was over. Butler emancipated these slaves in spite of the fact that he knew this was against Lincoln's policy. As the flood kept coming, he seized abandoned sugar plantations and began to work them with Negro labor for the benefit of the government.

By permission of the War Department, and under the authority of the Confiscation Act, Butler organized colonies of fugitives, and regulated employment. His brother, Colonel Butler, and others worked plantations, hiring the Negro labor. The Negroes stood at Butler's right hand during the trying time of his administration, and particularly the well-to-do free Negro group were his strongest allies. He was entertained at their tables and brought down on himself the wrath and contempt, not simply of the South, but even of the North. He received the black regiment, and kept their black officers, who never forgot him. Whatever else he might have been before the war, or proved to be afterwards, "the colored people of Louisiana under the proper sense of the good you have done to the African race in the United States, beg leave to express to you your gratitude."

From 1862 to 1865, many different systems of caring for the escaped slaves and their families in this area were tried. Butler and his successor, Banks, each sought to provide for the thousands of destitute freedmen with medicine, rations and clothing. When General Banks took command, there was suffering, disease and death among the 150,000 Negroes. On January 30, 1863, he issued a general order making labor on public works and elsewhere compulsory for Negroes who had no means of support.

Just as soon, however, as Banks tried to drive the freedmen back to the plantations and have them work under a half-military slave regime, the plan failed. It failed, not because the Negroes did not want to work, but because they were striking against these particular conditions of work. When, because of wide protest, he began to look into the matter, he saw a clear way. He selected Negroes to go out and look into conditions and to report on what was needed, and they made a faithful survey. He set up a little state with its department of education, with its landholding and organized work, and after experiment it ran itself. More and more here and up the Mississippi Valley, under other commanders and agents, experiments extended and were successful.

Further up the Mississippi, a different system was begun under General Grant. Grant's army in the West occupied Grand Junction, Mississippi, by November, 1862. The usual irregular host of slaves then swarmed in from the surrounding country. They begged for protection against recapture, and they, of course, needed food, clothing and shelter. They could not now be reenslaved through army aid, yet no provision had been made by anybody for their sustenance. A few were employed as teamsters, servants, cooks and scouts, yet it seemed as though the vast majority was left to freeze and starve, for when the storms came with the winter months, the weather was of great severity.

Grant determined that Negroes should perform many of the camp duties ordinarily done by soldiers; that they should serve as fatigue men in the departments of the surgeon general, quartermaster, and commissary, and that they should help in building roads and earthworks. The women worked in the camp kitchens and as nurses in the hospitals. Grant said, "It was at this point where the first idea of the Freedmen's Bureau took its origin."

Grant selected as head of his Department of Negro Affairs, John Eaton, chaplain of the Twenty-Seventh Ohio Volunteers, who was soon promoted to the colonelcy of a colored regiment, and later for many years was a Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Education. He was then constituted Chief of Negro Affairs for the entire district under Grant's jurisdiction.

"I hope I may never be called on again to witness the horrible scenes I saw in those first days of the history of the freedmen in the Mississippi Valley. Assistants were hard to get, especially the kind that would do any good in our camps. A detailed soldier in each camp of a thousand people was the best that could be done. His duties were so onerous that he ended by doing nothing... In reviewing the condition of the people at that time, I am not surprised at the marvelous stories told by visitors who caught an occasional glimpse of the misery and wretchedness in these camps... Our efforts to do anything for these people, as they herded together in masses, when founded on any expectation that they would help themselves, often failed; they had become so completely broken down in spirit, through suffering, that it was almost impossible to arouse them.

"Their condition was appalling. There were men, women and children in every stage of disease or decrepitude, often nearly naked, with flesh torn by the terrible experiences of their escapes. Sometimes they were intelligent and eager to help themselves; often they were be-
wilder or stupid or possessed by the wildest notions of what liberty might mean—expecting to exchange labor, and obedience to the will of another, for idleness and freedom from restraint. Such ignorance and perverted notions produced a veritable moral chaos. Croucing deceit, theft, licentiousness— all the vices which slavery inevitably fosters—were hideous companions of nakedness, famine, and disease. A few had profited by the misfortunes of the master and were jubilant in their unwonted ease and luxury, but these stood in lurid contrast to the grimmer aspects of the tragedy—the women in travail, the helplessness of childhood and of old age, the horrors of sickness and of frequent death. Small wonder that men paused in bewilderment and panic, foreseeing the demoralization and infection of the Union soldier and the downfall of the Union cause. 10

There were new and strange problems of social contact. The white soldiers, for the most part, were opposed to serving Negroes in any manner, and were even unwilling to guard the camps where they were segregated or protect them against violence. "To undertake any form of work for the contrabands, at that time, was to be forsaken by one's friends and to pass under a cloud." 11

There was, however, a clear economic basis upon which the whole work of relief and order and subsistence could be placed. All around Grand Junction were large crops of ungathered corn and cotton. These were harvested and sold North and the receipts were placed to the credit of the government. The army of fugitives were soon willing to go to work; men, women and children. Wood was needed by the river steamers and woodcutters were set at work. Eaton fixed the wages for this industry and kept accounts with the workers. He saw to it that all of them had sufficient food and clothing, and rough shelter was built for them. Citizens round about who had not abandoned their plantations were allowed to hire labor on the same terms as the government was using it. Very soon the freedmen became self-sustaining and gave little trouble. They began to build themselves comfortable cabins, and the government constructed hospitals for the sick. In the case of the sick and dependent, a tax was laid on the wages of workers. At first it was thought the laborers would object, but, on the contrary, they were perfectly willing and the imposition of the tax compelled the government to see that wages were promptly paid. The freedmen freely acknowledged that they ought to assist in helping bear the burden of the poor, and were flattered by having the government ask their help. It was the reaction of a new labor group, who, for the first time in their lives, were receiving money in payment for their work. Five thousand dollars was raised by this tax for hospitals, and with this money tools and property were bought. By wholesale

purchase, clothes, household goods and other articles were secured by the freedmen at a cost of one-third of what they might have paid the stores. There was a rigid system of accounts and monthly reports through army officials.

In 1864, July 5, Eaton reports: "These freedmen are now disposed of as follows: In military service as soldiers, laundresses, cooks, officers' servants, and laborers in the various staff departments, 41,150; in cities on plantations and in freedmen's villages and cared for, 72,500. Of these 62,300 are entirely self-supporting—the same as any industrial class anywhere else—as planters, mechanics, barbers, hackmen, draymen, etc., conducting enterprises on their own responsibility or working as hired laborers. The remaining 10,200 receive subsistence from the government. 3,000 of them are members of families whose heads are carrying on plantations and have under cultivation 4,000 acres of cotton. They are to pay the government for their sustenance from the first income of the crop. The other 7,200 include the paupers—that is to say, all Negroes over and under the self-supporting age, the crippled and sick in hospital, of the 113,650 and those engaged in their care. Instead of being unproductive, this class has now under cultivation 500 acres of corn, 770 acres of vegetables and 1,500 acres of cotton, besides working at wood-chopping and other industries. There are reported in the aggregate over 100,000 acres of cotton under cultivation. Of these about 7,000 acres are leased and cultivated by blacks. Some Negroes are managing as high as 300 or 400 acres." 12

The experiment at Davis Bend, Mississippi, was of especial interest. The place was occupied in November and December, 1864, and private interests were displaced and an interesting socialist effort made with all the property under the control of the government. The Bend was divided into districts with Negro sheriffs and judges who were allowed to exercise authority under the general control of the military officers. Petty theft and idleness were soon reduced to a minimum and the community distinctly demonstrated the capacity of the Negro to take care of himself and exercise under honest and competent direction the functions of self-government. 13

When General Butler returned from Louisiana and resumed command in Virginia and North Carolina, he established there a Department of Negro Affairs, with the territory divided into districts under superintendents and assistants. Negroes were encouraged to buy land, build cabins and form settlements, and a system of education was established. In North Carolina, under Chaplain Horace James, the poor, both black and white, were helped; the refugees were grouped in small villages and their work systematized, and enlisted men taught in the schools, followed by women teachers from the North. Outside
BLACK RECONSTRUCTION

of New Bern, North Carolina, about two thousand freedmen were settled and 800 houses erected. The department at Port Royal continued. The Negroes showed their capacity to organize labor and even to save and employ a little capital. The government built 21 houses for the people on Edisto Island. The carpenters were Negroes under a Negro foreman. There was another village of improved houses near Hilton Head.

"Next as to the development of manhood: this has been shown in the first place in the prevalent disposition to acquire land. It did not appear upon our first introduction to these people, and they did not seem to understand us when we used to tell them that we wanted them to own land. But it is now an active desire. At the recent tax sales, six out of forty-seven plantations sold were bought by them, comprising two thousand five hundred and ninety-five acres, sold for twenty-one hundred and forty-five dollars. In other cases, the Negroes had authorized the superintendent to bid for them, but the land was reserved by the United States. One of the purchases was that made by Harry, noted above. The other five were made by the Negroes on the plantations, combining the funds they had saved from the sale of their pigs, chickens and eggs, and from the payments made to them for work,—they then dividing off the tract peaceably among themselves. On one of these, where Kit, before mentioned, is the leading spirit, there are twenty-three freedmen. They have planted and are cultivating sixty-three acres of cotton, fifty of corn, six of potatoes, with as many more to be planted, four and a half of cowpeas, three of peanuts, and one and a half of rice. These facts are most significant." 14

Under General Saxton in South Carolina, the Negroes began to buy land which was sold for non-payment of taxes. Saxton established regulations for the cultivation of several abandoned Sea Islands and appointed local superintendents.

"The payment of moderate wages, and just and fair dealing with them, I produced for the government over half a million dollars' worth of cotton, besides a large amount of food beyond the needs of the laborers. These island lands were cultivated in this way for two years, 1864 and 1865, under my supervision, and during that time I had about 15,000 colored freedmen of all ages in my charge. About 9,000 of these were engaged on productive labor which relieved the government of the support of all except newly-arrived refugees from the enemy's lines and the old and infirm who had no relations to depend upon. The increase of industry and thrift of the freedmen was illustrated by their conduct in South Carolina before the organization of the Freedmen's Bureau by the decreasing government expenditure for their support. The expense in the department of the South in 1865 was
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$41,544, but the monthly expense of that year was steadily reduced, until in December it was less than $1,000." 14

Into this fairly successful land and labor control was precipitated a vast and unexpected flood of refugees from previously untouched strongholds of slavery. Sherman made his march to the sea from Atlanta, cutting the cotton kingdom in two as Grant had invaded it along the Mississippi.

"The first intimation given me that many of the freedmen would be brought hither from Savannah came in the form of a request from the General that I would 'call at once to plan the reception of seven hundred who would be at the wharf in an hour.' This was Christmas day, and at 4 P.M., we had seven hundred—mainly women, old men and children before us. A canvass since made shows that half of them had traveled from Macon, Atlanta and even Chattanooga. They were all utterly destitute of blankets, stockings or shoes; and among the seven hundred there were not fifty articles in the shape of pots or kettles, or other utensils for cooking, no axes, very few coverings for many heads, and children wrapped in the only article not worn in some form by the parents." Frantic appeals went out for the mass of Negro refugees who followed him.

A few days after Sherman entered Savannah, Secretary of War Stanton came in person from Washington. He examined the condition of the liberated Negroes found in that city. He assembled twenty of those who were deemed their leaders. Among them were barbers, pilots and sailors, some ministers, and others who had been overseers on cotton and rice plantations. Mr. Stanton and General Sherman gave them a hearing.

As a result of this investigation into the perplexing problems as to what to do with the growing masses of unemployed Negroes and their families, General Sherman issued his epoch-making Sea Island Circular, January 18, 1865. In this paper, the islands from Charleston south, the abandoned rice fields along the rivers for thirty miles back from the sea and the country bordering the St. John's River, Florida, were reserved for the settlement of the Negroes made free by the acts of war and the proclamation of the President.

General Rufus Saxton was appointed Inspector of Settlements and Plantations and was required to make proper allotments and give possessor titles and defend them until Congress should confirm his actions. It was a bold move. Thousands of Negro families were distributed under this circular, and the freed people regarded themselves for more than six months as in permanent possession of these abandoned lands. Taxes on the freedmen furnished most of the funds to run these first experiments. On all plantations, whether owned or
leased, where freedmen were employed, a tax of one cent per pound on cotton and a proportional amount on all other products was to be collected as a contribution in support of the helpless among the freed people. A similar tax, varying with the value of the property, was levied by the government upon all leased plantations in lieu of rent.

Saxton testified: “General Sherman’s Special Field Order No. 15 ordered their colonization on forty-acre tracts, and in accordance with which it is estimated some forty thousand were provided with homes. Public meetings were held, and every exertion used by those whose duty it was to execute this order to encourage emigration to the Sea Islands, and the faith of the government was solemnly pledged to maintain them in possession. The greatest success attended the experiment, and although the planting season was very far advanced before the transportation to carry the colonists to the Sea Islands could be obtained, and the people were destitute of animals and had but few agricultural implements and the greatest difficulty in procuring seeds, yet they went out, worked with energy and diligence to clear up the ground run to waste by three years’ neglect; and thousands of acres were planted and provisions enough were raised for those who were located in season to plant, besides a large amount of sea island cotton for market. The seizure of some 540,000 acres of abandoned land, in accordance with the act of Congress and orders from the head of the bureau for the freedman and refugees, still further strengthened these ignorant people in the conviction that they were to have the lands of their late masters; and, with the other reasons before stated, caused a great unwillingness on the part of the freedmen to make any contracts whatever. But this refusal arises from no desire on their part to avoid labor, but from the cause above stated...”

“To test the question of their foresight and prove that some of the race at least thought of the future, I established in October, 1864, a savings bank for the freedmen of Beaufort district and vicinity. More than $240,000 had been deposited in this bank by freedmen since its establishment. I consider that the industrial problem has been satisfactorily solved at Port Royal, and that, in common with other races, the Negro has industry, prudence, forethought, and ability to calculate results. Many of them have managed plantations for themselves, and show an industry and sagacity that will compare favorably in their results—making due allowances—with those of white men.”

Eventually, General Saxton settled nearly 30,000 Negroes on the Sea Islands and adjacent plantations and 17,000 were self-supporting within a year. While 12,000 or 13,000 were still receiving rations, it was distinctly understood that they and their farms would be held responsible for the payment. In other such cases, the government had found that such a debt was a “safe and short one.”

Negroes worked fewer hours and had more time for self-expression. Exports were less than during slavery. At that time the Negroes were mere machines run with as little loss as possible to the single end of making money for their masters. Now, as it was in the West Indies, emancipation had enlarged the Negro’s purchasing power, but instead of producing solely for export, he was producing to consume. His standard of living was rising.

Along with this work of the army, the Treasury Department of the United States Government was busying itself. The Secretary of the Treasury, Salmon P. Chase, early in 1862, had his attention called to the accumulation of cotton on the abandoned Sea Islands and plantations, and was sure there was an opportunity to raise more. He, therefore, began the organization of freedmen for cotton raising, and his successor, William Pitt Fessenden, inaugurated more extensive plans for the freedmen in all parts of the South, appointing agents and organizing freedmen’s home colonies.

On June 7, 1862, Congress held portions of the states in rebellion responsible for a direct tax upon the lands of the nation, and in addition Congress passed an act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint special agents to take charge of captured and abandoned property. Military officers turned over to the Treasury Department such property, and the plantations around Port Royal and Beaufort were disposed of at tax sales. Some were purchased by Negroes, but the greater number went to Northerners. In the same way in North Carolina, some turpentine farms were let to Negroes, who managed them, or to whites who employed Negroes. In 1863, September 17, the whole Southern region was divided by the Treasury Department into five special agencies, each with a supervising agent for the supervision of abandoned property and labor.

Early in 1863, General Lorenzo Thomas, the adjutant general of the army, was organizing colored troops along the Mississippi River. After consulting various treasury agents and department commanders, including General Grant, and having also the approval of Mr. Lincoln, he issued from Milliken’s Bend, Louisiana, April 15th, a lengthy series of instruction covering the territory bordering the Mississippi and including all the inhabitants.

He appointed three commissioners, Messrs. Field, Shickle and Livemore, to lease plantations and care for the employees. He sought to encourage private enterprises instead of government colonies; but he fixed the wages of able-bodied men over fifteen years of age at $7 per month, for able-bodied women $5 per month, for children twelve to
fifteen years, half price. He laid a tax for revenue of $2 per 400 pounds of cotton, and five cents per bushel on corn and potatoes.

This plan naturally did not work well, for the lessees of plantations proved to be for the most part adventurers and speculators. Of course such men took advantage of the ignorant people. The commissioners themselves seem to have done more for the lessees than for the laborers; and, in fact, the wages were from the beginning so fixed as to benefit and enrich the employer. Two dollars per month was charged against each of the employed, ostensibly for medical attendance, but to most plantations thus leased no physician or medicine ever came, and there were other attendant cruelties which availed contrived.

On fifteen plantations leased by the Negroes themselves in this region there was notable success, and also a few other instances in which humanity and good sense reigned; the contracts were generally carried out. Here the Negroes were contented and grateful, and were able to lay by small gains. This plantation arrangement along the Mississippi under the commissioners as well as the management of numerous infirmary camps passed, about the close of 1863, from the War to the Treasury Department. A new commission or agency with Mr. W. P. Mellon of the treasury at the head established more careful and complete regulations than those of General Thomas. This time it was done decidedly in the interest of the laborers.

July 2, 1864, an Act of Congress authorized the treasury agents to seize and lease for one year all captured and abandoned estates and to provide for the welfare of former slaves. Property was declared abandoned when the lawful owner was opposed to paying the revenue. The Secretary of the Treasury, Fessenden, therefore issued a new series of regulations relating to freedmen and abandoned property. The rebellious States were divided into seven districts, with a general agent and special agents. Certain tracts of land in each district were set apart for the exclusive use and working of the freedmen. These reservations were called Freedmen Labor Colonies, and were under the direction of the superintendents. Schools were established, both in the Home Colonies and in the labor colonies. This new system went into operation the winter of 1864-1865, and worked well along the Atlantic Coast and Mississippi Valley. In the Department of the Gulf, however, there was discord between the treasury agents and the military authorities, and among the treasury officials themselves. The treasury agents, in many cases, became corrupt, but these regulations remained in force until the Freedmen's Bureau was organized in 1865.

By 1865, there was strong testimony as to the efficiency of the Negro worker. "The question of the freedmen being self-supporting no longer agitated the minds of careful observers."

---

Carl Schurz felt warranted in 1865 in asserting: "Many freedmen—not single individuals, but whole 'plantation gangs'—are working well; others are not. The difference in their efficiency coincides in a great measure with a certain difference in the conditions under which they live. The conclusion lies near, that if the conditions under which they work well become general, their efficiency as free laborers will become general also, aside from individual exceptions. Certain it is, that by far the larger portion of the work done in the South is done by freedmen!"

Whitelaw Reid said in 1865: "Whoever has read what I have written about the cotton fields of St. Helena will need no assurance that another cardinal sin of the slave, his laziness—inborn and ineradicable, as we were always told by his masters—is likewise disappearing under the stimulus of freedom and necessity. Dishonesty and idleness, then, were the creation of slavery, not the necessary and constitutional faults of the Negro character."

"Returning from St. Helena in 1865, Doctor Richard Fuller was asked what he thought of the experiment of free labor, as exhibited among his former slaves, and how it contrasted with the old order of things. 'I never saw St. Helena look so well,' was his instant reply; 'never saw as much land there under cultivation—never saw the same general evidences of prosperity, and never saw Negroes themselves appearing so well or so contented.' Others noticed, however, that the islands about Beaufort were in a better condition than those nearer the encampments of the United States soldiers. Wherever poultry could be profitably peddled in the camps, cotton had not been grown, nor had the Negroes developed, so readily, into industrious and orderly communities." Similar testimony came from the Mississippi Valley and the West, and from Border States like Virginia and North Carolina.

To the aid of the government, and even before the government took definitive organized hold, came religious and benevolent organizations. The first was the American Missionary Association, which grew out of the organization for the defense of the Negroes who rebelled and captured the slave ship Amistad and brought it into Connecticut in 1839. When this association heard from Butler and Pierce, it responded promptly and had several representatives at Hampton and South Carolina before the end of the year 1861. They extended their work in 1862-1863, establishing missions down the Atlantic Coast, and in Missouri, and along the Mississippi. By 1864, they had reached the Negroes in nearly all the Southern States. The reports of Pierce, Du Pont and Sherman aroused the whole North. Churches and missionary societies responded. The Friends contributed. The work of
the Northern benevolent societies began to feel and money, clothing, and, finally, men and women as helpers and teachers came to the various centers.

"The scope of our work was greatly enlarged by the arrival of white refugees—a movement which later assumed very large proportions. As time went on Cairo (Illinois) became the center of our activities in this direction. It was the most northerly of any of our camps, and served as the portal through which thousands of poor whites and Negroes were sent into the loyal states as fast as opportunities offered for providing them with homes and employment. Many of these became permanent residents; some were sent home by Union soldiers to carry on the work in the shop or on the farm which the war had interrupted. It became necessary to have a superintendent at Cairo and facilities for organizing the bands of refugees who were sent North by the army. There was an increasing demand for work."

New organizations arose, and an educational commission was organized in Boston, suggested by the reports of Pierce, and worked chiefly in South Carolina. Afterward, it became the New England Freedmen's Aid Society and worked in all the Southern States. February 21, 1862, the National Freedmen's Relief Association was formed in New York City. During the first year, it worked on the Atlantic Coast, and then broadened to the whole South. The Port Royal Relief Committee of Philadelphia, later known as the Pennsylvania Freedmen's Relief Association, the National Freedmen's Relief Association of the District of Columbia, the Contraband Relief Association of Cincinnati, afterward called the Western Freedmen's Commission, the Women's Aid Association of Philadelphia and the Friends' Associations, all arose and worked. The number increased and extended into the Northwest. The Christian Commission, organized for the benefit of soldiers, turned its attention to Negroes. In England, at Manchester and London, were Freedmen's Aid Societies which raised funds; and funds were received from France and Ireland.

Naturally, there was much rivalry and duplication of work. A union of effort was suggested in 1862 by the Secretary of the Treasury and accomplished March 21, 1865, when the American Freedmen's Union Commission was incorporated, with branches in the chief cities. Among its officers were Chief Justice Chase and William Lloyd Garrison. In 1865, two large voluntary organizations to reduce suffering and mortality among the freedmen were formed. The Western Sanitary Commission at St. Louis, and the United States Sanitary Commission at Washington, with branches in leading cities, then began to relieve the distress of the freedmen. Hospitals were improved, supplies distributed, and Yeatman's plan for labor devised.

**THE GENERAL STRIKE**

Destitute white refugees were helped to a large extent. But even then, all of these efforts reached but a small portion of the mass of people freed from slavery.

Late in 1863, President Yeatman of the Western Sanitary Commission visited the freedmen in the Mississippi Valley. He saw the abuses of the leasing system and suggested a plan for organizing free labor and leasing plantations. It provided for a bureau established by the government to take charge of leasing land, to secure justice and freedom to the freedmen; hospital farms and homes for the young and aged were to be established; schools with compulsory attendance were to be opened. Yeatman accompanied Mellon, the agent of the department, to Vicksburg in order to inaugurate the plan and carry it into effect. His plan was adopted by Mellon, and was, on the whole, the most satisfactory.

Thus, confusion and lack of system were the natural result of the general strike. Yet, the Negroes had accomplished their first aim in those parts of the South dominated by the Federal army. They had largely escaped from the plantation discipline, were receiving wages as free laborers, and had protection from violence and justice in some sort of court.

About 20,000 of them were in the District of Columbia; 100,000 in Virginia; 50,000 in North Carolina; 50,000 in South Carolina, and as many more each in Georgia and Louisiana. The Valley of the Mississippi was filled with settlers under the Treasury Department and the army. Here were nearly 500,000 former slaves. But there were 3,500,000 more. These Negroes needed only the assurance that they would be freed and the opportunity of joining the Northern army. In larger and larger numbers, they filtered into the armies of the North. And in just the proportion that the Northern armies became in earnest, and proposed actually to force the South to stay in the Union, and not to make simply a demonstration, in just such proportion the Negroes became valuable as laborers, and doubly valuable as withdrawing labor from the South. After the first foolish year when the South woke up to the fact that there was going to be a real, long war, and the North realized just what war meant in blood and money, the whole relation of the North to the Negro and the Negro to the North changed.

The position of the Negro was strategic. His was the only appeal which would bring sympathy from Europe, despite strong economic bonds with the South, and prevent recognition of a Southern nation built on slavery. The free Negroes in the North, together with the Abolitionists, were clamoring. To them a war against the South simply had to be a war against slavery. Gradually, Abolitionists no
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longer need fear the mob. Disgruntled leaders of church and state began to talk of freedom. Slowly but surely an economic dispute and a political test of strength took on the aspects of a great moral crusade.

The Negro became in the first year contraband of war; that is, property belonging to the enemy and valuable to the invader. And in addition to that, he became, as the South quickly saw, the key to Southern resistance. Either these four million laborers remained quietly at work to raise food for the fighters, or the fighter starved. Simultaneously, when the dream of the North for man-power produced riots, the only additional troops that the North could depend on were 200,000 Negroes, for without them, as Lincoln said, the North could not have won the war.

But this slow, stubborn mutiny of the Negro slave was not merely a matter of 200,000 black soldiers and perhaps 300,000 other black laborers, servants, spies and helpers. Back of this half million stood 3½ million more. Without their labor the South would starve. With arms in their hands, Negroes would form a fighting force which could replace every single Northern white soldier fighting listlessly and against his will with a black man fighting for freedom.

This action of the slaves was followed by the disaffection of the poor whites. So long as the planters’ war seemed successful, “there was little active opposition by the poorer whites; but the conscription and other burdens to support a slaveowners’ war became very severe; the whites not interested in that cause became recalcitrant, some went into active opposition; and at last it was more desertion and disunion than anything else that brought about the final overthrow.”

Phillips says that white mechanics in 1861 demanded that the permanent Confederate Constitution exclude Negroes from employment “except agricultural domestic service, so as to reserve the trades for white artisans.” Beyond this, of course, was a more subtle reason that, as the years went on, very carefully developed and encouraged for a time the racial aspect of slavery. Before the war, there had been intermingling of white and black blood and some white planters openly recognized their colored sons, daughters and cousins and took them under their special protection. As slavery hardened, the racial basis was emphasized; but it was not until war time that it became the fashion to put the disfranchised poor white man on the back and tell him after all he was white and that he and the planters had a common interest in keeping the white man superior. This virus increased bitterness and relentless hatred, and after the war it became a chief ingredient in the division of the working class in the Southern States.

At the same time during the war even the race argument did not keep the Southern fighters from noticing with anger that the big slaveholders were escaping military service; that it was a “rich man’s war and the poor man’s fight.” The exemption of owners of twenty Negroes from military service especially rankled; and the wholesale withdrawal of the slaveholding class from actual fighting which this rule made possible, gave rise to intense and growing dissatisfaction.

It was necessary during these critical times to insist more than usual that slavery was a fine thing for the poor white. Except for slavery, it was said: “The poor would occupy the position in society that the slaves do—as the poor in the North and in Europe do, for there must be a menial class in society and in ‘every civilized country on the globe, besides the Confederate states, the poor are the inferiors and menials of the rich.’ Slavery was a greater blessing to the non-slaveholding poor than to the owners of slaves, and since it gave the poor a start in society that it would take them generations to work out, they should thank God for it and fight and die for it as they would for their ‘own liberty and the dearest birthright of freemen.’”

But the poor whites were losing faith. They saw that poverty was fighting the war, not wealth.

“Those who could stay out of the army under color of the law were likely to be advocates of a more numerous and powerful army. ... Not so with many of those who were not favored with position and wealth. They grudgingly took up arms and condemned the war which had snatched them from their homes. ... The only difference was the circumstance of position and wealth, and perhaps these were just the things that had caused heartburnings in more peaceful times.

“The sentiments of thousands in the upland countries, who had little interest in the war and who were not accustomed to rigid centralized control, was probably well expressed in the following epistle addressed to President Davis by a conscript. ...

... It is with intense and multifariously proud satisfaction that he [the conscript] gazes for the last time upon our holy flag—that symbol and sign of an adored trinity, cotton, niggers and chivalry.”

This attitude of the poor whites had in it as much fear and jealousy of Negroes as disaffection with slave barons. Economic rivalry with blacks became a new and living threat as the blacks became laborers and soldiers in a conquering Northern army. If the Negro was to be free where would the poor white be? Why should he fight against the blacks and his victorious friends? The poor white not only began to desert and run away; but thousands followed the Negro into the Northern camps.

Meantime, with perplexed and laggard steps, the United States Government followed the footsteps of the black slave. It made no difference how much Abraham Lincoln might protest that this was not a
war against slavery, or ask General McDowell "if it would not be well to allow the armies to bring back those fugitive slaves which have crossed the Potomac with our troops" (a communication which was marked "secret"). It was in vain that Lincoln rushed entreaties and then commands to Frémont in Missouri, not to emancipate the slaves of rebels, and then had to hasten similar orders to Hunter in South Carolina. The slave, despite every effort, was becoming the center of war. Lincoln, with his uncanny insight, began to see it. He began to talk about compensation for emancipated slaves, and Congress, following almost too quickly, passed the Confiscation Act in August, 1861, freeing slaves which were actually used in war by the enemy. Lincoln then suggested that provision be made for colonization of such slaves. He simply could not envisage free Negroes in the United States. What would become of them? What would they do? Meantime, the slave kept looming. New Orleans was captured and the whole black population of Louisiana began streaming toward it. When Vicksburg fell, the center of perhaps the largest Negro population in North America was tapped. They rushed into the Union lines. Still Lincoln held off and watched symptoms. Greeley's "Prayer of Twenty Millions" received the curt answer, less than a year before Emancipation, that the war was not to abolish slavery, and if Lincoln could hold the country together and keep slavery, he would do it.

But he could not, and he had no sooner said this than he began to realize that he could not. In June, 1862, slavery was abolished in the territories. Compensation with possible colonization was planned for the District of Columbia. Representatives and Senators from the Border States were brought together to talk about extending this plan to their states, but they hesitated.

In August, Lincoln faced the truth, front forward; and that truth was not simply that Negroes ought to be free; it was that thousands of them were already free, and that either the power which slaves put into the hands of the South was to be taken from it, or the North could not win the war. Either the Negro was to be allowed to fight, or the draft itself would not bring enough white men into the army to keep up the war.

More than that, unless the North faced the world with the moral strength of declaring openly that they were fighting for the emancipation of slaves, they would probably find that the world would recognize the South as a separate nation; that ports would be opened; that trade would begin, and that despite all the military advantage of the North, the war would be lost.

In August, 1862, Lincoln discussed Emancipation as a military measure; in September, he issued his preliminary proclamation; on
larger divisions of trade, it is only under exceptional circumstances that any Negro no matter what his ability, gets an opportunity for position and power. Only in those lines where individual enterprise still counts, as in some of the professions, in a few of the trades, in a few branches of retail business and in artistic careers, can the Negro expect a narrow opening.

Negroes and other colored folk nevertheless, exist in larger and growing numbers. Slavery, prostitution to white men, theft of their labor and goods have not killed them and cannot kill them. They are growing in intelligence and dissatisfaction. They occupy strategic positions, within nations and beside nations, amid valuable raw material and on the highways of future expansion. They will survive, but on what terms and conditions? On this point a new school of Negro thought is arising. It believes in the ultimate uniting of mankind and in a unified American nation, with economic classes and racial barriers leveled, but it believes this is an ideal and is to be realized only by such intensified class and race consciousness as will bring irresistible force rather than mere humanitarian appeals to bear on the motives and actions of men.

The peculiar position of Negroes in America offers an opportunity. Negroes today cast probably 2,000,000 votes in a total of 40,000,000, and their vote will increase. This gives them, particularly in northern cities, and at critical times, a chance to hold a very considerable balance of power, and the mere threat of this being used intelligently and with determination may often mean much. The consuming power of 2,800,000 Negro families has recently been estimated at $165,000,000 a month—a tremendous power when intelligently directed. Their manpower as laborers probably equals that of Mexico or Yugoslavia. Their illiteracy is much lower than that of Spain or Italy. Their estimated per capita wealth about equals that of Japan.

For a nation with this start in culture and efficiency to sit down and await the salvation of a white God is idiotic. With the use of their political power, their power as consumers, and their brainpower,
Alys Eve Weinbaum

Gendering the General Strike:
W. E. B. Du Bois's Black Reconstruction and
Black Feminism’s "Propaganda of History"

This investigation into the gendered afterlife of slavery begins with the perhaps contentious observation that there are two main periods in the history of racial capitalism during which women's reproductive labor power and reproductive products have been engineered for profit: first, during the four hundred years of chattel slavery in the Americas; and, second, in the current conjuncture—a period stretching back to the birth of biocapitalism in the late 1970s and forward into the twenty-first century. My contention is not that women's reproductive labor, broadly construed as the reproduction of workers and the relations of production, has not been exploited at other times and in other places, but rather that over the last four decades the human reproductive body, in a robust material sense, has been increasingly exploited in a manner that has precedent in chattel slavery and its culture of enslaved reproduction. Today, women's gestational capacities and the raw materials that women reproduce—which include but are not restricted to human beings, eggs, and embryonic stem cells—are commodified resources available for direct exploitation, investment, and speculative development. Taken together, reproductive exploitation and the
necessarily correlated commodification of reproductive labor and products thus suggest the urgency of examining the relationship of the contemporary reproductive scene to that of chattel slavery, the principal economic system predicated on women’s productive and reproductive labor, on women’s work in the fields and household and on their reproduction of human, biological commodities.

Although a range of thinkers has attended to the intersection of racism, sexism, and capitalism in the context of globalization, here I propose that black feminism produced in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s—including theory, history, and literary fiction (especially so-called neoslave narratives)—constitutes the principal philosophy of history that is adequate to the task of both comprehending the gendered afterlife of slavery as it manifests as an uncanny feature of racial capitalism’s global expansion and imagining resistance to it. In limning cycles of historical repetition black feminism not only makes visible the material, ideological, and cultural continuities that haunt as they actively enable the exploitation of human reproductive labor and its products. Black feminism also imagines an alternative future. Indeed, through an examination of the scale and scope, material and psychic, of women’s reproductive exploitation, black feminism animates the struggles for freedom from reproductive bondage that slave women fought—and, in the process, suggests how such struggles might yet inform a response to present conditions. In this sense, black feminist productions, expressed in multiple idioms, can be thought of as what Robin Kelley has called “freedom dreams,” utopian aspirations that transform conventional understandings of human “agency” and “resistance,” and the connections of both to Marxist materialist mainstays such as “work,” “the worker,” and “class consciousness.” As Kelley explains, to conceive of freedom dreams is to “recover ideas—visions fashioned mainly by those marginalized black activists who proposed a different way out of our contradictions” (Kelley 2002: xii). However, he cautions, the point in so doing is not to “wholly embrace their ideas or strategies as the foundation for new movements” (xii). Rather, the point is to allow recovered ideas to “tap the well of our own collective imaginations” (xii)—that is to “dream” (again) of forms of “freedom” that are unbound from free enterprise.

In insisting on the singular importance of black feminist “freedom dreams” to both the analysis of and the response to racial capitalism and biocapitalism’s present imbrication, it is important to note that other scholars have considered black feminism in somewhat different terms. Some have placed it in the context of the long civil rights movement, the rise of
Black Power, and the ascendance of racially dominant forms of feminism (see Springer 2005; White 1999; Giddings 1984), and cast it as a negotiation of the sexism and masculinism (and sometimes heterosexism) of black nationalism, on the one hand, and as a response to the racism and classism of second wave feminism, on the other. Others have demonstrated through historical work on reproductive rights how, beginning in the 1970s, black feminists (along with other race radical feminists) shifted from a narrow focus on access to abortion to examination of an entire range of reproductive freedoms, including the economic freedom to bear, raise, and care for children and, not least, freedom from sterilization abuse and related forms of racist, sexist, and ultimately eugenic coercion (see Nelson 2003; and Siliman et al. 2004).

While these interpretations must necessarily be considered, here I also situate black feminist production as part of a long black radical tradition invested in full-scale critique of racial capitalism, starting with slavery. Building on the work of theorists such as Roderick Ferguson and Grace Hong who have read black feminism as a response to late capitalism and on that of literary critics such as Hazel Carby, Ann duCille, Deborah McDowell, and Valerie Smith (to name only a few) who have treated motherhood in black women’s fiction, I offer a proleptic reading of black feminism as a response to the long history of racialized reproductive exploitation that has its roots in chattel slavery. In doing so, I key black feminism to its moment of production, a moment indelibly marked by the rise of human biological commodification and thus by an economic formation that recent scholars have dubbed the “tissue economy,” the “bioeconomy,” or most powerfully, “biocapitalism.”

Although biocapitalism has not been recognized as a formative context or interpretative lens by other scholars of black feminism, here I argue it is imperative to recognize that black feminism emerged, coalesced, and expanded as the global economy increasingly gravitated toward investment in biotechnological processes and products and grew giant pharmaceutical and biotech companies (that, in turn, created variegated markets for biological, human commodities). And, too, it is imperative to understand that the flourishing of black feminism across three decades thus necessarily reflects and refracts the emergence of racialized forms of biocapitalism, and, more particularly, an emergent economy in which women’s reproductive labor power and products are (once again) being commodified with intensifying speed. When we shift from conceptualizing black feminism as a reaction to the flawed political movements by which it was surrounded and to which it
contributed, it comes into view as a profound meditation on the long history of reproduction in bondage and the gendered afterlife of slavery, and also as a profound response to questions first posed in 1935 by W. E. B. Du Bois’s *Black Reconstruction*. As we shall see, in this watershed text Du Bois boldly posited slaves as black workers and the Civil War as a world historical protest against the conditions of slave work, including slave women’s work as sex slaves and breeders.

**Gendering the General Strike**

Although it may at first seem counterintuitive to situate *Black Reconstruction* as pivotal to the proposed project of recontextualizing and recalibrating the contributions of black feminism in and for biocapitalism, in creating a dialogue between *Black Reconstruction* and black feminism, it becomes possible to identify not only shared Marxist resonance and revisionism but also *Black Reconstruction*’s albeit unintentional summoning of black feminist freedom dreams. Black feminism not only persistently engages the most important concepts that animate *Black Reconstruction*’s story of the implosion of slavery, the outbreak of the Civil War, and the foreclosed horizons that are its aftermath, but it also takes up and further develops the Du Boisian idea of the “general strike” of slaves against slavery as the motor of modern history, recalibrating, as it does so, the Du Boisian methodology that transforms historical narration into counter-propaganda capable of offering forward new “truths” about the past that might alter futures yet to come.

In reading *Black Reconstruction* in order to raise what I will shorthand as the question of the gender of the general strike and, in turn, in reading black feminism as a meditation on the general strike, I highlight how and why women’s removal of reproductive labor and products from circulation was at one time, and might yet still remain, a revolutionary act that has not been but ought to be understood as part of the strike of black workers against slavery. For even though Du Bois only fleetingly casts female slaves as workers who elected to take their labor power out of circulation, in placing *Black Reconstruction* and black feminism into dialogue we can begin to recognize that slave women’s protest against the exploitation of their sexual and reproductive labor—against rape and the work of breeding—was as central to the struggle against slavery in the nineteenth century as it might yet be to the struggle against contemporary biocapitalism.

If black feminists provide the standpoint that allows us to recognize breeding as work and to protest against it as a privileged model for biocapital-
ist times, the question arises: is Du Bois really necessary to the dialogue? After all, according to many, Du Bois ought not be considered a profeminist or even a protofeminist thinker. As biographers and critics concur, he was a "retrograde rake" who played the role of "priapic adulterer" throughout several decades in an unhappy first marriage (Elam and Taylor 2008: 209; Lewis 2000: 267). He had a notoriously poor track record of publically crediting the women antilynching crusaders, civil rights activists, and literary muses and editors who surrounded him and collaborated with him. And when he did write on gender and sexuality (as he does in Black Reconstruction), his contributions are often unself-conscious, unsustained, contradictory, or a combination thereof (see James 2008 and Carby 2008). In short, while it is not credible to read Black Reconstruction as feminist, here I argue that it is nonetheless invaluable in that it performs an explosive, if fleeting, opening up of the question of the gender and sexual politics of slavery and the revolt against it. This opening up is most apparent when Du Bois's historical narrative (which is also a historiographical corrective) is parsed not for evidence of sustained treatment of gender and sexuality, but rather for the manner in which it calls forth feminist questions about the historical processes that it describes and the methodology that it models. For in this way, Black Reconstruction excavates the conceptual site where black feminist analyses of slave women's participation in the war against slavery will eventually coalesce—that is, around the question of the gender of the general strike.

Given the compendious nature of the story of the transition from slavery to war and from war to the failures of Reconstruction that Black Reconstruction offers, it is instructive that Du Bois's analysis of sex and reproduction is restricted to the opening chapters that lead into discussion of the general strike and, thus, to chapters focused on the conflicts that erupted, under the pressure of slavery's internal contradictions, into the full-blown historical crisis that found expression in civil war. As Cedric Robinson notes, Du Bois's recasting of the slave as the "black worker" caught up in an eruptive moment is a decisively Marxist move and also a major innovation on Marxism. In insisting on the slave as "worker," Du Bois retooled the idea of the paid laborer as the model proletarian and rendered the unpaid, hyperexploited slave the centerpiece of a black revolution (see Robinson 1977; 1983: 185–240). In this way, Du Bois positioned slavery as a subsystem of world capitalism, and the Civil War and the crushing of the revolutionary impulses that animated it as two world historical events that set the stage for the development of a violent modernity grounded in human slavery and the racialized, global division of labor that we today inherit.
And yet, while Robinson beautifully captures the enormity of Du Bois’s conceptual shift away from traditional Marxist conceptions of history and historical agency, he is not alert to the manner in which *Black Reconstruction* poses questions about the black worker’s gender and about reproductive and sexualized aspects of slave work, especially at the outset of the book. Indeed, the black worker whom Robinson describes is presumptively without gender or, perhaps more aptly, reifies the already implicit masculinity of the Marxist category. And thus, while I build on Robinson’s insights, I also find it necessary to bring into view that which Robinson neglects in his reading of *Black Reconstruction*, namely, Du Bois’s groundbreaking, if ultimately unsustained and inconsistent, account of the reproductive and sexual nature of slave women’s work and of their resistance to it.

In Du Bois’s opening sally in his book’s first chapter, “The Black Worker,” he acknowledges the centrality of the self-production of “real estate” to the system of slavery and thus the manner in which forced sex and “breeding” subterranean the reproduction of the relations of production within slavery. As he explains, “Human slavery in the South pointed and led in two singularly contradictory and paradoxical directions—toward the deliberate commercial breeding and sale of human labor for profit and toward the intermingling of black and white blood. The slaveholders shrank from acknowledging either set of facts but they were clear and undeniable” (Du Bois 1992: 11). When Du Bois goes on to discuss rape in the “deliberate commercial breeding” of slaves, he emphasizes the instrumental role of sexual violence in the perpetuation of the slave economy. And, finally, when he discusses runaways, he posits them as historical agents protesting the conditions of their labor (and thus as figures that allow him to anticipate his argument about revolutionary agency as developed in his subsequent chapter, “The General Strike”), two of the three runaways he mentions are women. This singling out of female fugitives is noteworthy; the historical consensus was (and remains) that men were more able and likely to run. Women, uniquely constrained by duties to family and ties to children, necessarily considered their actions in the context of their motherhood—electing whom to leave behind or take along—and thus frequently negotiating maternity as the condition and context of action. Apparently Du Bois regarded slave women, even when operating under conditions of constricted mobility, as active agents in rebellion against the system.

Following “The Black Worker” is “The Planter.” Together these chapters set up the opposition of forces that animate the rest of the book. In “The Planter,” consideration of the gendered and sexualized social dynamics of
slavery intensifies. In a passage on the slave home, for instance, Du Bois examines the impact on the structure of slave families of women's labor in the fields, imagining the destabilization of family bonds and the insecurity and vulnerability of children that this situation produced (1992: 40). So, too, he considers the emotional toll on women of the "raising of slaves... for systematic sale on the commercialized cotton plantations" (41), where he believes reproductive exploitation to have been most extensively practiced and the forced separation of families most pervasive.

While in each of these instances Du Bois attends to the gender-specific conditions of work and the impact of women's work on slaves' intimate, familial, and psychic lives, it is when he imagines the toll taken by planter violence on planter men that he most powerfully conceptualizes the gendered and sexualized violence to which slave women were subjected as catalyzing the crisis that brought down the entire system of slavery. When planters sought to increase surplus through increased exploitation of workers, Du Bois observes, they routinely employed reproductive and productive forms of exploitation. They increased crops and profits by acquiring more land and took up the lash to force all workers to increase productivity. They also increased it by engineering enslaved women's rate of reproduction of human commodities through explicit orchestration of both sexual and reproductive violence. As Du Bois makes plain, the planters' "only effective economic movement... could take place against the slave. He was forced, unless willing to take lower profits, continually to beat down the cost of slave labor... One method called for more land and the other for more slaves" (1992: 41). While planters "surrounded it with certain secrecy, and it was exceedingly bad taste for any... planter to have it indicated that he was deliberately raising slaves for sale... that was a fact... A laboring stock was deliberately bred for legal sale" (42–43). As Du Bois concludes, these "plain facts" were nonetheless "persistently denied" by planters. Indeed, because planters, "could not face the fact of Negro women as brood mares and of black children as puppies"—because the system they had created "so affronted the moral sense of the planters themselves that they tried to hide from it" (43)—they shamefacedly responded to their own involvement and investment in slave breeding with forms of disavowal that found expression in the violence that they directed toward enslaved women and the children these women bore for, and often to, planters.

Du Bois's ensuing discussion of the "sexual chaos that arose from [the] economic motives" (44), which, he laments, characterized plantation life, exhibits both his understanding of slave women's particular exploitation and
an all-too-familiar sexist and bourgeois concern with, what he calls here and elsewhere, the lack of a “bar to illegitimacy” (44), which was slave breeding’s necessary correlate. As Du Bois’s moral ire surfaces, in other words, it undercuts the feminist potential of the analysis that precedes it. And yet, undercutting duly noted, what comes before—Du Bois’s account of sexual and reproductive exploitation as foundational to the interstate slave trade—remains of utmost importance. The fact remains: Du Bois’s main argument in his book’s central chapter on planter-slave relations is built out of an account of the sexual and reproductive exploitation that enslaved women were forced to endure at the hands of planters. The upshot: through its implicit teleological movement Du Bois’s narrative emphasizes, even as it forecloses, the centrality of sexual and reproductive exploitation to the profitability of slavery. It underscores, even as it undercuts, the fact that the antagonism between planters and enslaved women was part and parcel of the antagonism between black workers and planters that led to the eruption of the internal contradictions of slavery and, in turn, to the Civil War. And although Du Bois never expresses it thus, his narrative suggests that when the slave systems’ internal contradictions reached their breaking point, the crisis precipitated ought to be understood, at least in part, as a result of enslaved women’s revolt against planters’ gendered and sexualized violence against them—as a strike against the world that the planters created with and through their female slaves, through exploitation of their sexuality and reproductive labor power and commodification of the children born into slavery.

In the recursive historical rhythm of Du Bois’s book as a whole (he moves from antagonism, to revolt, to crisis, to re-entrenchment, and then again to antagonism), the gendered and sexualized reproductive contradictions that are constitutive to the narrative at the outset go missing from the story of war and Reconstruction that eventually unfolds. The unfortunate result is that the chapter, “The General Strike” (which immediately follows “The Planter”), is evacuated of the account of reproductive and sexual work and the account of gendered and sexualized conflict that was initially offered. Here, slaves emerge as black workers, but as workers they are no longer gender differentiated. Likewise, the slaves who are variously described throughout this chapter as “swelling,” “floodling,” and “swarming” Union troops (1992: 64–65), as withdrawing their labor from plantations, as sabotaging the production of surplus through labor stoppages, and as staunching the supply of food to plantations and Union troops are virtually all characterized as male. Consequently, when Du Bois arrives at the apex of his argument and suggests that the black worker (now fully transformed into an insurgent
member of the black proletariat) was not "merely . . . [expressing] the desire to stop work," but rather "[the Civil War] was a strike on a wide basis against the conditions of work" (1992: 67), these conditions are unself-consciously stripped of the gender-differentiated labor processes and of the reproductive and sexualized exploitation that Du Bois had, up until this point, observed throughout his narrative.

For readers immersed in the story of the black worker and the planter and the gendered and sexualized antagonism between the two, Du Bois's discussion of the general strike signals an abrupt narrative break. It also marks the presence of a profound conceptual aporia. Suddenly, slave work emerges solely as the production of agricultural commodities. But, what about the production of those other, more fleshy raw materials that Du Bois had posited as essential to the existence and reproduction of the slave economy? What of the black female workers whom he had, until this crucial point in his narrative, recognized as the workers responsible for the reproduction of human commodities for sale on the interstate market? In short, how do we account for the disappearance of reproductive workers, reproductive work, and reproductive work's products, human chattel? In performing the foreclosure of these questions, Du Bois's account of the general strike inaugurates an exquisite experience of simultaneous narrative opening and deferral: the question of slave women's reproductive and sexual labor infuses the story that precedes that on the strike—that is, the chapters that are devoted to the crisis that produces the general strike. And yet, when Du Bois treats the strike itself, the female worker as a singular figure and the sexual and reproductive labor that is part of the general work performed by the collectivity of black workers are no longer anywhere in evidence. Where a gender-differentiated black mass once momentarily stood, a masculinized labor force takes its place; where sexual and reproductive labor was acknowledged, it has been subsumed within the category of productive work.

The textual aporia that remains is the result of unexamined textual juxtapositions and interrupted narrative momentum, and it begs a series of essential but too often unasked questions about the gendered historiography of slavery and about historical epistemology more generally: How might our understanding of the history of slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction be transformed if we considered enslaved women as participants in a general strike against slavery? How might we imagine slave women's protest against the conditions of their reproductive and sexual work and the forms that such protest might have taken? What alternative genres and narrative idioms lend themselves to exploration of slave women's membership in the mass of black
workers who took labor out of circulation in the process of waging war? What alternative narrative approaches would enable the imagination of slave women's withdrawal of sexual and reproductive labor, and thus of their contributions to what Du Bois called "a strike on a wide basis against the conditions of work" (1992: 67)? And, finally, how should concepts such as "work," "worker," and "class consciousness" be reconceived so that they become responsive to the question of the gender of the general strike?

Clearly, the general strike is an invaluable heuristic tool that can be used to study enslaved reproduction and also the impact of slave women's protest against sexual and reproductive exploitation. However, in the present moment, a historical corrective is not the only, or even principal, stake. Rather, the question of the gender of the general strike must be asked because it connects the past to the present and presses us to imagine historical continuities, links between women's protest against the conditions of work in the past and struggles against biocapitalism in the present. Put differently, the challenge posed by the question of the general strike is not solely about creation of a gendered supplement to dominant historiography. In the spirit of Black Reconstruction, the challenge also lies in the reconceptualization of the stakes of historical inquiry in the present and for the future. While new "facts" are welcome, incorporation of new, unverifiable truths recalibrates received understandings of the relationship between past and present and, too, of the relationship of the past to a future that lies in the balance. It may be impossible to know with empirical certainty what a general strike inclusive of women's protest against reproductive and sexual exploitation looked like in 1861, and yet we might grasp the political urgency of being able to imagine such a strike and, too, of imagining what a strike against reproductive exploitation might yet look like in a future moment—in a yet-to-arrive crisis characterized by the revolt of reproductive bodies against "the conditions of work" and by the removal of reproductive labor and products from circulation.

"The Propaganda of History" and the Rise of Black Feminism

"The propaganda of history" is the only idea explored in Black Reconstruction that is as often debated as that of "the general strike." In the chapter so named, often reproduced as a stand-alone treatise on historiography, Du Bois offers a searing two-pronged critique of how "the facts of American history have in the last half century been falsified because the nation was ashamed" (1992: 71) and of how such falsified "facts" have contributed to
the perpetuation of not only a national but also the global racial formation. In producing this critique, Du Bois crystalizes his book’s twinned agendas: (1) refutation of the long history of the “scandalous white historiography” of the Civil War and its aftermath, and (2) demonstration, through analysis of the promise and failures of Reconstruction, of historiography’s role in the legitimation of Jim Crow, a global culture of imperial and colonial domination, and a corresponding racial division of labor predicated on exploitation of those whom Du Bois had, for several decades, taken to describing as “the darker peoples of the world.”

In not only casting white historiography as propaganda but also suggesting that all historians are implicated in a contest over historical “truth” in and for the present, Du Bois situated historical narratives, his own included, as necessarily presentist. As he suggests, history ought not be geared solely toward correction of the record; it should also ring changes on the meaning of “propaganda” through the production of “truths” that might ideally catalyze a more liberated future. To this end, Black Reconstruction exemplifies the methodology it proposes, demonstrating what its title announces: it is a black (re)construction of white supremacist propaganda, a form of counterpropaganda that produces the “truth” of the counternarrative that it elaborates, even as it mobilizes this narrative for the present moment of writing. As already discussed, one of the central “truths” Black Reconstruction proffers is that of the slave as “the black worker” and of slaves, en masse, as agents of human emancipation. But what of the other “truths” that press for a hearing when the question of the gender of the general strike is raised? It is here that black feminism enters, constituting a response to the gendered aporia Black Reconstruction opens up—a unique, future-oriented response that grasps this aporia not only as an absence but also as an imaginative possibility. For when read in and through its exchange with Black Reconstruction, black feminism emerges as nothing less than a new “propaganda of history”—a counternarrative insistent on accounting for enslaved women and, too, for the continued relevance of the story of enslaved women’s protest against their reproductive and sexual exploitation in the moment of black feminist elaboration.

Though numerous texts might be drawn on in order to limn the cultural, political, and activist horizon that I have throughout short-handed “black feminism,” I turn first to those written in the 1970s that explicitly treat slave women’s protest against sexual and reproductive exploitation and imagine the importance of these protests for the present. These early, historiographical interventions set the stage for the outpouring of black feminist
fiction that, I argue, constitutes the apogee of black feminist response to the question of the gender of the general strike and to the rise of biocapitalism. "Reflections on the Black Woman's Role in the Community of Slaves" is, to my knowledge, the first article to expressly argue for the centrality of women's day-to-day resistance to slavery. In it, Angela Davis posits domestic life in the slave quarters as the primary site of sustained protest against slavery. Originally written while Davis was in prison, as part of an unfinished exchange with fellow Black Panther George Jackson, Davis's (1971) article takes aim at the neglected history of slave women and at the figure of the so-called black matriarch, which, at the time of her writing, formed the basis for public perception and policy on the black family, especially in the wake of Daniel Patrick Moynihan's infamous report.

Building on Black Reconstruction's revisionist project, Davis corrects the historical record somewhat unconventionally. Making clear to readers that her concern is excavation of the past in the interest of the illumination of the present, she observes: "The matriarchal black woman has repeatedly been invoked as one of the fatal by-products of slavery. . . . An accurate portrait of the African woman in bondage must debunk the myth of the matriarchate. Such a portrait must simultaneously attempt to illuminate the historical matrix of her oppression and must evoke her varied, often heroic response to the slaveholder's domination" (1971: 4). In refuting the myth "at its presumed historical inception" (3), Davis first moves to defamiliarize the dominant historical account of slave rebellion and resistance. On the one hand, she unsettles the notion (which, she observes, is too often held by male scholars, black and white alike) that black women "actively assented" (4) to slavery and related to "the slave holding class as collaborators." On the other hand, she submits the unprecedented thesis that it was, "by virtue of the brutal force of circumstances . . . [that] the black woman," as opposed to the black man, "was assigned the mission of promoting the consciousness and practice of [slave] resistance" (5).

Davis offers two interrelated arguments for the black woman's exceptional centrality to slave resistance. Domestic space was the site of resistance because it was at the greatest distance from slaveholders' reach: "of necessity . . . [the slave] community would revolve around the realm which was furthermost removed from the immediate arena of domination. It could only be located in and around the living quarters, the area where the basic needs of physical life were met" (6). In ministering to the needs of men and children, she continues, slave women performed "the only labor of the slave community which could not be directly and immediately claimed by the
oppressor,” and it was thus “only in domestic life . . . away from the eyes and whip of the overseer . . . that slaves could . . . assert . . . freedom” (6). Whereas previous accounts had focused on documented rebellions and revolts, Davis (following in the footsteps of social historians such as Herbert Gutman) highlights the quotidian: “If,” she hypothesizes, “domestic labor was the only meaningful labor for the slave community as a whole” (7), then slave women’s labor not only “increased the total incidence of anti-slavery assaults,” but should be viewed as the “barometer indicating the overall potential for [slave] resistance” (15). Contra Du Bois, who lamented slave women’s inability to do the care work involved in social and cultural reproduction, Davis regards “domestic work” as a source of not only individual but also community sustenance and resistance.

Although Davis’s arguments have been challenged (some have queried her ideas about “domestic space” and her emphasis on women’s role within it; others have taken issue with a perhaps misplaced attribution of “agency”), in creating a dialogue between Black Reconstruction and black feminism that integrates both into the long history of black radical critique of racial capitalism, it is ultimately unnecessary to adjudicate whether Davis got it “right” or “wrong.” Rather, in keeping with the spirit of Davis’s project, we should historicize it, effectively reading Davis’s contribution as a context-specific response to the question of the gender of the general strike—as a response that imagines the importance of this strike for Davis’s present and the future. “Davis pushes readers toward recognition of her imaginative project by acknowledging her scholarly shortcomings, engaging potential objections to her argument, and delineating the political gains that are to be had by nonetheless forging ahead. As she notes, “no extensive and systematic study of the role of black women in resisting slavery has come to my attention,” and yet there is great “urgency to undertake a thorough study of the black woman as anti-slavery rebel” (1971: 9). In prison, without access to archives and sources, Davis knows she can offer neither a complete nor an in-depth study; instead, she provides “a portrait of the potential and possibilities inherent in the situation to which slave women were anchored” (14, emphasis added). In prying a story of the gender of the general strike from available sources, in other words, in working with and against the few historiographical texts at her disposal, Davis seeks not to prove but rather to imagine slave women’s resistance as central to the downfall of slavery and to forecast how knowledge of this resistance might yet impact black women’s liberation and the black liberation movement’s engagement with black women’s history and future more generally.
Given Davis's strategy, it is perhaps unsurprising when she rapidly exhausts discussion of women's participation in slave revolts as documented in existing scholarship (her discussion of organized revolts is almost entirely gleaned from an against the grain reading of Herbert Aptheker's 1943 classic, *American Negro Slave Revolts*) and concedes that in order to show that black women's insurgent response to "counter-insurgency [is] not as extravagant as it might seem" (Davis 1971: 8), it is necessary to build the argument from a new starting place. Indeed, in order to recognize "the black woman as anti-slavery rebel" (Davis 1971: 9), she not only mines available historiographical accounts, but also, and more importantly, imagines the female "insurgency" that evoked the principal form of "counterinsurgency" to which slave women were routinely subjected by planters: rape.

Davis's argument that rape is *counterinsurgency* and that women's resistance to rape is thus a major form of *insurgence* transforms her essay into counterpropaganda and paves the way for future black feminist responses to the question of the gender of the general strike. Turning attention away from "open battles," from organized acts of rebellion, Davis focuses instead on individual, intimate acts of resistance that might not be evident in available archives (and the scholarship based on them). Such quotidian acts, she *imagines*, constituted the resistant reality of the majority of slave women. As she explains, "The oppression of slave women had to assume dimensions of open counter-insurgency" (1971: 12). In rape and forced reproduction, the slave woman also must have "felt the edge of this counter-insurgency [the master's] as a fact of her daily existence" (12). Routine acts of sexual aggression ought to be recognized as "terrorist methods designed to dissuade other black women from following the examples of their [insurgent] sisters" (12). Making recourse to the conditional tense—and, thus, calling attention to the politically imperative (as opposed to factually grounded) nature of her conclusions—Davis specifies, "the act of copulation, reduced by the white man to an animal-like act *would* be symbolic of the effort to conquer the resistance the black woman *could* unloose. In confronting the black woman as adversary in a sexual contest, the master *would* be subjecting her to the most elemental form of terrorism distinctively suited for the female" (13, emphasis added). Having introduced the idea of women's insurgency as a self-evident historical "truth" (as opposed to "fact")—that is, having introduced the idea of insurgency on the basis of the then-controversial idea that planters routinely raped slaves—Davis brilliantly concludes that slave women routinely *provoked* and *countered* counterinsurgency.
The power of Davis’s argument resides in its ability to fold the reader’s knowledge of the “truth” in on itself and then to actively convert this knowledge into felt (as opposed to documented) evidence of women’s resistance to slavery. From one perspective, Davis argues, women’s and men’s productive labor was exploited; from another perspective (one that prefigures subsequent work on the paradoxical un-gendering of slave women [see, among others, Spillers 1987]), Davis argues that women’s resistance to exploitation must be understood as a response to sexual and reproductive exploitation. By “reestablish[ing] her femaleness by reducing her to the level of her biological being,” she writes, the master directly “attack[ed] . . . the black female as a potential insurgent” whose resistance to domination ought thus to be simultaneously understood as specifically female and as integral to the larger strike against slavery (Davis 1971: 13). As Davis concludes: “Countless black women did not passively submit to these abuses, as the slaves in general refused to passively accept their bondage. The struggles of the slave woman . . . were a continuation of the resistance interlaced in the slaves’ daily existence” (4).

Whereas Du Bois had positioned Black Reconstruction as a critique of white supremacist historiography, as counterpropaganda possessing the power to restore agency to black workers and to their descendants, Davis positions her work as a critique of the prevailing masculinist historiography of slavery possessing the power to restore agency to female slaves and their descendants. Davis’s slave woman is not the emasculating matriarch of Moynihan’s report; rather, she is a sexually and reproproductively oppressed worker whose gendering by the master class is meted out as sexualized violence against her (re)productive body. Neither victim nor aggressor in any simple sense, she is an active member of a striking collectivity whose contribution to the larger struggle against slavery is expressed through individual, often intimate protests that specifically target the sexualized and reproductive conditions of production—the conditions responsible for the maintenance of the entire system of slavery, especially after the end of the transatlantic trade in 1807. After dispensing with the Moynihan report (“a dastardly ideological weapon designed to impair our capacity for resistance by foisting upon us the ideal of male supremacy” [14]), Davis offers a final appeal to readers (especially “us” black women) to whom she has demonstrated, as had Du Bois before her, that the history of slavery matters in the present and for the future.

While historians rarely cite Davis’s article, presumably regarding it as too undisciplined and politicized, most feminist historians of slavery have
nonetheless entered into the groundbreaking conversation that Davis initiated. In 1979, for instance, Darlene Clark Hine questioned the dominant focus of slavery studies, implicitly following Davis in calling for study of the sexual economy of slavery. In "Female Slave Resistance: The Economics of Sex," Hine focuses on "black female resistance to slavery" by not only positing enslaved women as insurgent (as had Davis), but also by imagining the specific "means through which female slaves expressed their political and economic opposition to the slave system" (1979: 123). Delineating three "intimately related forms of resistance"—sexual abstinence, abortion, and infanticide—Hine argues that women's resistance to sexual and reproductive exploitation contributed to the overthrow of the slave system. When "they resisted sexual exploitation, ... [when they] reject[ed] their vital economic function as breeders," Hine observes, female slaves rejected their "role in the economic advancement of the slave system," undermining the "master's effort to profit from [female slaves] ... by exploiting [them] sexually." Such resistance to sexual and reproductive exploitation, she concludes, though private and individualized, nonetheless had "major political and economic implications" (126).

Although it is beyond the scope of this article to treat the numerous contributions made by black feminist historians in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, suffice it to say that Davis's and Hine's essays are representative of a multivoiced black feminist response to the question of the gender of the general strike that was expressed by Deborah Gray White, Nell Irvin Painter, Paula Giddings, Kathleen Thompson, and a subsequent generation of scholars that includes Mia Bay, Stephanie Camp, Sharla Fett, Thavolia Glymph, and Jennifer Morgan, among many others. What brings this black feminist work into dialogue with Black Reconstruction is the manner in which it expands on one of Du Bois's most profound ideas. As Cedric Robinson has eloquently expressed it, in Black Reconstruction Du Bois shows us that slaves needed to be neither consciously nor collectively organized in the traditional Marxist sense in order to make history. As black feminists writing about women in slavery concur, slave women's strikes against sexual and reproductive bondage, though not necessarily consciously or collectively organized, nonetheless possessed profound revolutionary force. In resisting sexual assault, committing infanticide, or aborting unwanted pregnancies, women refused their work as sex slaves and as breeders—and thus refused to participate in the reproduction of the slave system and in the reproduction of the human commodities that sustained it. Indeed, from the vantage point opened up by black feminist historians, we comprehend that the "work" per-
formed by "the black worker" of whom Du Bois wrote necessarily involved sexual and reproductive labor as well as productive (agricultural and domestic) labor. And while there may be no way to empirically verify the extent to which slave women were conscious that their individual, intimate acts of resistance contributed to the overthrow of slavery, the existence and persistence of planter counterinsurgency must itself be recognized as an excellent index of the impact that slave women's sexual and reproductive insurgency must have continuously exerted.\textsuperscript{18}

The Reproduction of "Freedom"

Both alongside of and then in the wake of the production of the nonfiction discussed thus far, black women writers pushed at the limits of the conventions of historical narrative, not only working to write counterhistory, but also to differently—and more popularly—explore the relevance of historical imagination for black feminist production. Creating what some subsequently came to call "neoslave narratives," these writers imagined the experience of bondage from the vantage point of slave women, utilizing the creative latitude offered by fiction to enter into the battle over historical "truth" while at the same time sidestepping some of the thorny questions that historians have raised about archive and interpretation. While male authors also participated (and in some accounts of the genre, invented it), black women's contributions comprise the genre's dominant and most distinct formation.\textsuperscript{19} On the one hand, black women writers contested the masculinism of the stories told about slavery by centralizing enslaved women and their children. On the other hand, as they produced fiction that exposed the sexism of the historiography of both slavery and an emerging black male literary canon, they materialized the power of works of creative imagination to inaugurate a new propaganda of history. Improvising on earlier feminist historiographical work, black women writers offered alternative methodological and epistemological responses to the question of the gender of the general strike, entering into dialogue with \textit{Black Reconstruction} in yet another black feminist idiom.

Short stories and especially novels focused on women in slavery—including those by Octavia Butler, Lorene Cary, Michelle Cliff, J. California Cooper, Nalo Hopkinson, Gayl Jones, Toni Morrison, Alice Walker, and Sherley Anne Williams, to name some of the most well known—thematize, \textit{without exception}, the experience of motherhood in bondage and hone in on reproductive and sexual exploitation and the protest against it. Daring to
imagine (again, without exception) what existing historical archives cannot fully reveal, these writers describe how individual women took sexual and reproductive labor and products out of circulation, and they explore how women and children felt about and understood their actions. As importantly, insofar as these writers tell stories of women who recode, as they appropriate, sexual and reproductive labor and its products, bestowing on them new meaning, they collectively guide readers toward comprehension of the relationship between the present moment of writing and the slave past—toward comprehension of the relationship between the forms of exploitation that characterize the biocapitalist world out of which black women writers emerged, in which they wrote, and to which they respond.

Although space does not allow for close readings of the fictional texts treated in the book project from which this article is drawn, I conclude by offering a provisional sketch of the literary terrain that highlights how it moves backward to slavery and forward into the present moment of production, effectively bridging the two most significant periods in biocapitalist expansion. In the 1970s Gayle Jones and Octavia Butler presented fictional portraits of black women who struggle to interrupt the intergenerational cycles of slavery’s reproduction by questioning their own participation in them and, in so doing, altering the hold of the past on the supposedly emancipated present. In Jones’s Corregidora, a novel published in the wake of the Supreme Court’s passage of Roe v. Wade and the emergence of a women of color reproductive rights movement, the protagonist, Ursa, wrests control of her reproductive life from the men who attempt to possess her sexuality and reproduction and, in the process, overdetermine her relationship to her family’s slave past. Specifically, Ursa’s repossess of her body and bodily processes involves recoding violently imposed infertility—her transformation of “barrenness” into an embodied revision of three generations of rape, incest, and forced fecundity, as experienced by her female forebears. As Jones details, Ursa’s refusal to “make generations” and her repetition, with a difference, of a passed-on story of sexual and reproductive exploitation strengthens as it simultaneously reworks Ursa’s connection to her grandmother and great-grandmother, each of whom, unlike Ursa, had reproduced a girl-child impregnated by its father/master. Straddling the past of slavery and her present through song, Ursa emerges as a phonic time traveler whose art form replaces childbirth with vocalization. In short, Corregidora responds to the question of the gender of the general strike in the form of a manifesto for freedom from reproductive and sexual exploitation that is articulated by Jones and her protagonist alike in the idiom of the blues.
In Butler’s watershed novel, *Kindred*, the narrative is driven by yet another time-traveling protagonist, Dana, who moves between 1970s California and a plantation in the Deep South where her ancestors reside. Dana appears to be pulled across time by a compulsion to save her white, slave-owning ancestor and, at once, to ensure that he fathers her enslaved female foremother. In a story focused on the complexity of obtaining “freedom” in either 1976 (the ironically symbolic year in which the novel opens) or during the midnineteenth century (when the novel is set), it is imperative to underscore that securing existence (literally her birth) requires Dana to manipulate the reproductive life of an enslaved woman, her great-great grandmother, Alice. In this sense, Dana’s present “freedom” is predicated on the denial of that same “freedom” to an enslaved woman—and more particularly still on her reproductive (ab)use of this woman.

While available scholarship on *Kindred* has focused almost exclusively on Dana, it ought to grant her progenitor, Alice, as much if not more attention. When we read the novel as a response to the question of the gender of the general strike, it is on Alice’s repeated, desperate protests against enslaved sex and reproduction that we ought to focus if we hope to understand the space of resistance to slavery that exists within the claustrophobic confines of the novel. As Butler details, Alice battles to choose her lover (and then, too, against his violent murder by her master); she protests her sexual enslavement by her master; she fights against loss of control over her children; and finally, she protests against their removal by taking her body out of sexual and reproductive use, once and for all, by committing suicide. While it would be a mistake to sanguinely redeem this suicide as an unmitigated “success,” Alice’s act should be recognized as a resistant one that exists along a continuum comprised of multiple forms of withdrawal of sexual and reproductive labor from circulation. Indeed, all of Alice’s protests are insurgent acts against the reproductive and sexual conditions of work on the plantation on which she resides that ought to be understood as gendered contributions to the larger general strike against slavery.\(^\text{21}\)

Significantly, in the year prior to *Kindred*’s publication the successful and healthy birth of the first so-called test-tube baby, Louise Brown, by in vitro fertilization (IVF) was widely reported in the international press. As Butler completed her novel the ethics of biotechnological engineering of human reproduction burst into public consciousness through intensive media coverage of the event—“Baby of the Century”—and more focused academic scrutiny. As was clear from the outset, the advent of IVF revolutionized reproductive medicine and opened up new markets. The fertilization of
eggs outside the body allowed women to be impregnated with genetic materials to which they were unrelated and for women to sell their reproductive labor—to work as human incubators. In the wake of Louise Brown's birth, moreover, the market in surrogate labor took off, as did the market in an array of assisted reproductive technologies that would soon enable gestational surrogates (today the primary type of surrogate laborers) to gestate unrelated genetic materials and to (re)produce children belonging to other, unrelated people. As the celebrated doctors of reproductive medicine, Robert Edwards and Patrick Steptoe, raced to develop the technique that would result in Louise Brown's birth, in other words, Butler, together with other black feminists, catalyzed the outpouring of black feminist fiction about sex and reproduction in bondage that would continue unabated for nearly three decades—the same three decades that would witness the rise of the newly (re)formed biocapitalist economy.

By the 1980s, when black women's production of neoslave narratives reached its apex, public and scholarly outcry over various forms of reproductive exploitation and the emergence of ever-expanding forms of commodification of the human reproductive process, body, and bodily products was loud and insistent. In 1986, when US surrogate mother Mary Beth Whitehead publically breached her contract and refused to turn her baby over to the couple that had purchased her reproductive labor, Whitehead became a household name and the so-called Baby M case an object of academic study. As feminist activists and scholars sought to understand the emergence of a surrogate industry powered by new reproductive technologies, they launched a series of sustained arguments against baby selling, against the commodification of human reproduction and children, and against the emergence of a racialized class of hyperexploited, impoverished breeders whom, they presciently forecast, would increasingly be used to reproduce designer children for those able to pay the price.22

For some, surrogacy revealed reproductive labor as profoundly similar to other forms of productive labor for sale on the market.23 For others, it was connected to both wage slavery and the long history of chattel slavery. As Davis observed in the wake of the Baby M case, the historical parallels between motherhood in late capitalism and slavery run in two temporal directions: "The reproductive role imposed upon African slave women bore no relationship to the subjective project of motherhood. . . . Slave women were birth mothers or genetic mothers—to employ terms rendered possible by the new reproductive technologies—but they possessed no legal rights as mothers, of any kind. Considering the commodification of their children—
indeed, of their own persons—their status was similar to that of the contemporary surrogate mother” (1998: 212). According to Davis, surrogacy and the conceptual terminology that it has produced alter our understanding of the slave past and vice versa: “The term surrogate mother might be invoked as a retroactive description of . . . [slave women’s] status because the economic appropriation of their reproductive capacity reflected the inability of the slave economy to produce and reproduce its own laborers” (212). Conversely, Davis concludes, “While the new technological developments have rendered the fragmentation of maternity more obvious [than it was in the past], the economic system of slavery fundamentally relied upon alienated and fragmented maternities, as women were forced to bear children, whom masters claimed as potentially profitable machines” (213).

Davis’s final point is salutary and can be expanded further still: surrogacy and the rise of the reproductive economy that it signaled are directly connected to slavery not because contemporary surrogacy is solely performed by black women who are the descendants of slaves, or even because it is primarily performed by women or women of color in the global South (although this is increasingly the case). Rather, surrogacy must be linked to slavery and thus recognized as a racialized capitalist formation because it is in and through slavery that surrogacy becomes intelligible. Put differently, surrogacy and slavery must be linked because surrogacy has an irrepressibly racialized historical precedent. Indeed, surrogacy ought to be understood as a racialized biocapitalist formation enabled and invigorated by biocapitalism’s long history, including chattel slavery. And, reciprocally, chattel slavery ought to be understood as a biocapitalist formation from the retrospective vantage point of the emergence of a global market in surrogate labor and reproductive products.

Alongside the growth of the surrogate and reproductive technology industries throughout the 1980s and 1990s, so many black feminist fictions about reproduction in bondage were published that it is possible only to engage the most obvious one here. Crucially, though it is too often forgotten in criticism on Toni Morrison’s Beloved, the fictionalized story of Margaret Garner’s escape with her children from slavery and her subsequent murder of her daughter in an effort to “free” her from recapture by the master and his sons is lifted out of the context of slavery and moved by Morrison into the blurred historical horizon of the novel, which, tellingly, encompasses the Civil War and Reconstruction, as well as the present moment of Morrison’s writing. As Morrison explains in her 2004 forward, her invention of her protagonist, Sethe, as a reincarnation of Garner allowed her to plumb the story
for what “was historically true in essence, but not strictly factual in order to relate her history to contemporary issues about freedom, responsibility and women’s ‘place’” (Morrison 2004: xvii). In other words, Garner’s story allowed Morrison to meditate on women’s “freedom” in the 1980s and, at least implicitly, on the question of reproductive freedom. At that time reproductive freedom was being hotly debated by black feminists who were mobilized against sterilization abuse and the war on poor black mothers (especially “crack moms”) and, too, were involved in the larger feminist outcry against surrogacy. In short, although _Beloved_ has principally been read as an account of one woman’s struggle to free her children from slavery, it should also be read as an exploration of women’s participation in the general strike against sexual and reproductive bondage and as a meditation on women’s withdrawal of sexual and reproductive labor and products from circulation. The struggle for motherhood free from commodification was a central freedom dream of slave women in the historical past in which _Beloved_ is set and a central political preoccupation in the present from which Morrison wrote about this past. Underscoring this linkage, Davis invokes _Beloved_ as a relevant historical precedent in her discussion of surrogacy (1998: 212), because _Beloved_ tells a story of historical continuity, a story that has remained relevant across the long history of both racial capitalism and biocapitalism. Although separated by race and time, we can infer, Garner and Whitehead are connected by imbricated (albeit specific) experiences of the enslaving logic of reproductive commodification.

In this article, I have suggested that it is imperative to situate black feminism in its biocapitalist context of production, publication, and reception and to both recontextualize and recalibrate black feminist productions as together constituting a philosophy of history that is profoundly responsive to the slave past, our recent past, our present, and the future. In so doing I have placed black feminism within a long black radical tradition, and, in particular, as a response to the Du Boisian question of the gender of the general strike. I have argued that black feminism animates the freedom dreams that might yet allow us to track the gendered afterlife of slavery and to imagine how it might yet be resisted.

I conclude by pointing out that the sheer outpouring of black feminist productions that meditate on what it has meant and what it yet might mean for women to reproduce substantive freedom (as opposed to what Stephanie Smallwood [2004] has called “commodified freedom”) suggests a collective sense of urgency that those committed to substantive freedom ought to
embrace. Although each individual black feminist text differently explores the pitfalls and possibilities that inhere in the idea of “freedom,” hinged and unhinged from racialized, sexualized, and commodified reproduction, each also contributes to a larger cultural and political formation, the existence of which clears new epistemological ground and points the way to new idioms of political expression. In short, in reading black feminism as a propaganda of history, I am also suggesting that we might yet grasp it as an imaginative resource that has the power to reveal the significance of stories of reproduction in bondage set in the slave past, in our present, and for a future in which women might yet reproduce “freedom” rather than commodities.

Notes

1 For instance, world systems theorists have explored the global expansion of capitalism and attended to the racial divisions of labor in the global North and South. They have situated slavery and colonialism as twinned foundations of the modern world system and demonstrated the instrumentalization of race and racism in the division (and rationalization of the division) of the world’s labor force. In turn, feminists have examined the gendered division of labor in transnationalism and have attended to the hyperexploitation of women and the increasing feminization of the world’s labor force.


3 On biocapitalism see Sunder Rajan 2006; Cooper 2008; and Waldby and Mitchell 2006. Notably, this work focuses neither on the centrality of reproductive exploitation to biocapitalist expansion nor on the relationship between biocapitalism and slavery, save for one exception: see Waldby and Cooper 2008.

4 Moving from microscopic to multicellular products, there today exist markets in human blood, tissues, organs, gametes, embryos, and high-tech babies. The development of reproductive technologies in the late 1970s and 1980s that allow for the extraction of human eggs and their fertilization outside the female body led to the rapid growth in markets for human eggs and surrogate labor power. In the book project from which this article is drawn, I explore the dependence of biocapitalist expansion on the exploitation of the reproductive body as a source of raw materials and labor power.

5 Black Reconstruction exhibits a textual form I have elsewhere described as Du Bois’s “politics of juxtaposition.” In placing unremarked discussions of gender and sexual oppression and violence, in Du Bois’s own words, “right next to” discussion of racist and imperialist violence, Du Bois demonstrates the need for (but does not offer) an intersectional analysis of racism, sexism, and capitalism. In deferring such analysis, he defers participation in a political formation that he nonetheless marks as imperative. See Gillman and Weinbaum 2008b; and Weinbaum 2008.

6 Robinson (1983: 199–203) regards this as one of black Marxism’s foundational moments.
Du Bois writes, “Child-bearing was a profitable occupation that received every possible encouragement, and there was not only no bar to illegitimacy, but an actual premium put upon it. Indeed, the word was impossible of meaning under the slave system” (1992: 44).

When Du Bois does mention women in the war, he further undercuts their role by noting that they “accompained” husbands. I thank Thavolia Glymph for clarifying that from the beginning of the conflict black women fled to Union lines without men and often with children. Additionally, the enlistment of black men as soldiers in the Union Army left women especially vulnerable, leading to “swelling” numbers of black women among those “swarming.” The violence these women faced led to a growing number of orphaned children.

On the distinction between “fact” and “truth” see Morrison 1990. Robinson (1983: 44) also discusses historical “truth” in related ways.

On creation of “counter-history” that “can not be verified” and history that “tells an impossible story,” see Hartman 2008: 12.

This is the black internationalist language used throughout both Darkwater and Dark Princess—a language that is constitutively gendered and sexualized. See Weinbaum 2004: 187–226.

In his introduction to Black Reconstruction, David Levering Lewis designates it “propaganda for the people” (1992: xii), observing that it instantiates slaves and former slaves as agents of their own destiny. In the process, he argues, Du Bois transforms our understanding of the future that might evolve out of the past. Also see Lemert 2000.

Davis singles out E. Franklin Frazier for his support of these ideas in The Negro Family in the United States (1939); this appears to be one of the texts Davis had on hand in prison. Notably, Moynihan built his infamous argument out of his reading of Frazier’s.

Quotations from Du Bois in Davis’s article are from both Darkwater and Black Reconstruction.

Within Aptheker’s book Davis locates an account of black women’s role in fugitive and maroon communities, as insurgents within plantation households, and as participants in organized rebellions. As she implicitly laments, if reigning (male) historians would only interpret their findings correctly, they would discover that women were not only “the most daring and committed combatants” but also “the custodian[s] of a house of resistance” (1971: 8, 9).

Hine (1979) cites scholarship by field shapers such as Aptheker, Eugene Genovese, and Winthrop Jordan. Though she does not cite Davis, the solidarity of their projects remains salient.

Here I follow Robinson’s observation that “the general strike had not been planned or centrally organized. Instead, Du Bois termed as a general strike the total impact on the secessionist South of a series of actions circumstantially related to each other.... These events were a consequence of contradictions within Southern society rather than a revolutionary vanguard that knit these phenomena into a historical force” (Robinson 1977: 48). He continues, “with respect to class consciousness, Du Bois perceived that official Marxism had reduced this complex phenomenon to a thin political shell consisting of formulae for the dominance of state and/or part of workers’ movements. In order to resist this tendency, Du Bois sought to reintroduce the dialectic in its Hegelian form as the cunning of reason. No party could substitute itself for the
revolutionary instrument of history: a people moved to action by the social and material conditions of its existence" (50).

Hine suggests that some acts of resistance, including abortion, may have been collaborative, if not collectively organized in the conventional Marxist sense (1979: 123).

Novels by Alex Haley, Ishmael Reed, and Charles Johnson are often cast as precedent-setting texts within the genre against which a black feminist critique is launched. See Rushdy 1999. Though discussion of the genre is beyond this article's scope, feminist critics have noted that inclusion within the genre can be disabling. See, for example, Mitchell 2002; and Sharpe 2003.

For insightful discussions of the literary texts discussed in this article and in the book project (The Afterlife of Slavery: Human Reproduction in Biocapitalism) from which it is drawn I wish to thank Elizabeth Brown, Maia Chance, Gianna Craig, Claire Lee, Christopher Patterson, Alice Pedersen, Sue Shon, Balbir Singh, and Maya Smorodinsky—members of the first graduate seminar I taught in conjunction with my research on this project.

For an extended reading of Alice's role in Kindred, see Weinbaum 2013.

Most famously Gena Corea and members of the activist group FINNRAIG called for a moratorium on the use of all reproductive technologies and all forms of baby selling, surrogacy included. See Corea 1985; and Arditti, Klein, and Minden 1984.

On surrogacy as (re)productive labor, as wage labor with a difference that is felt in the laborer's body as life is extracted from it, see Weinbaum 1994.

In the 1980s surrogates received roughly $10,000 for raw materials (eggs), labor power (gestation and birth), and the contracted release of progeny. Prices (if not wages) have gone up substantially, and surplus distribution has shifted. Today, many surrogates, located in the global South, (re)produce for export to the global North. See Vora 2009.
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Government was a reality (66) in an expanded African-American community where black self-experience in its various forms could be shared and strengthened. The expansion of the role of the black community in the government was encouraged by the increased representation of African-Americans in elected positions. The government was an important arena for black self-determination and empowerment. The expansion of the government's role in addressing black issues was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting black self-sufficiency and self-reliance was also seen as a means of building black pride and self-esteem. The government's role in promoting education and economic opportunities for black Americans was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting civil rights and equality for all Americans was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting international cooperation and diplomacy was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting environmental protection and sustainability was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting health and social services was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting cultural and artistic expression was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting sports and recreation was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting technology and innovation was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting science and education was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment. The government's role in promoting social and economic justice was seen as a way to advance the cause of black equality and empowerment.
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The problem of the control and regulation of ammunition has been a topic of great concern and debate in recent years. The United States Congress has taken several steps to address the issue, including the passage of the Bipartisan Background Checks Act and the introduction of various gun control measures. However, the question of the regulation of ammunition remains a complex and contentious issue, with stakeholders on both sides of the debateاز مراجعات قانونية من أجل تحديد موقف الحكومة بشأن أسلحة الالتحاق، مع التركيز على منظورات المحافظين والمحافظين على الكونغرس، مع تقديم خيارات مختلفة من الإجراءات الرقابية الممكنة الممكنة. }
Democracy

A BLACK SISTER TO MASSACHUSETTS

Just recently, a letter to the Editor of the New York Times expressed the view that "the Negro problem is not a race problem, but a political problem." This is not so. The Negro problem is a political problem, but it is also a social problem. The Negro is not only denied the right to vote, but he is also denied the right to education, the right to housing, the right to employment, and the right to equal treatment under the law. These are all political problems, and they must be solved by political means.
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The border and economic underdevelopment in the countries covered by the program. This situation is further exacerbated by the economic sanctions and political isolation imposed by the international community. The United States' role in promoting democracy and human rights in the region is also controversial, with some claiming that it has been used as an excuse for interventionism.

In conclusion, the program has had mixed results. While it has brought some positive changes, such as increased political participation and media freedom, it has also faced criticism for its lack of effectiveness and unintended consequences. The future of the program remains uncertain, as it continues to evolve and adapt to changing political and economic conditions in the region.
Solidarity

BLACK EMPOWERMENT AND RACIAL

We Must Rise as a Race

If the story of black liberation is to move from the rhetoric of the 1960s to effect black racial solidarity, it must be a story that connects with the experience of black struggle. The struggle is not simply a matter of rights, but of a deeper, more existential struggle for identity and dignity. The struggle is not simply a matter of politics, but of a deeper, more existential struggle for community and belonging. The struggle is not simply a matter of equality, but of a deeper, more existential struggle for justice and freedom. The struggle is not simply a matter of power, but of a deeper, more existential struggle for power and control.
the people for the people. But perhaps one of the most important aspects of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is the idea that the government's actions are subject to the people's scrutiny and oversight. This is reflected in the American Constitution's system of checks and balances, which ensures that no branch of government becomes too powerful.

In 1899, President William McKinley signed into law the Sherman Antitrust Act, which was designed to prevent monopolies and promote competition. The act has been amended several times since then, but its original purpose was to protect the rights of consumers and workers.

The story of labor rights and the struggle for worker's compensation is another example of how the government has evolved to protect the interests of its citizens. The first workers' compensation law was passed in New York in 1910, but it wasn't until years later that other states followed suit.

Overall, the government's role in protecting the rights of its citizens is an ongoing process. As society evolves, so too must the laws and policies that govern it. The government must remain vigilant in its protection of the people, for it is only through this protection that we can truly say that we are a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.
incorporation in order to overcome white supremacy also stands in stark contrast to contemporary hostilities towards Latino immigrants grounded in fears of the "brown wave" of the country's culture. The displacement of its Anglo-Saxon political culture. His embrace of a composite U.S. nationality, fueled by immigration, where the boundaries are forged across racial and cultural lines, and the American political thought that has produced positive conceptions of multicultural democracy, in light of recent attempts to tear down the post-Fordist American landscape, is also especially useful for highlighting the spatial logic, temporal contours, and intellectual lineages of Douglass's thought.
Railroad in the Underground Frontline Communities: Transformation with Black Sanctuary and Democratizing Refuge}

Liz Heron and Romand Coles

Abstract

This article engages new histories of the black frontline communities as transformative possibilities of sanctuary as contrasted with the sanitization and the underground railroad to rethink black political democracy and the transformation of sanctuary as a key moment in human rights development.
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Because our thoughts and actions are often influenced by cultural, social, and political factors, it is important to be aware of the ways in which these forces shape our understanding of the world. This is especially true in the context of policy-making and decision-making processes.

In our daily lives, we are exposed to a wide range of opinions, ideas, and perspectives that shape our beliefs and actions. These influences can come from a variety of sources, including the media, education, and personal experiences.

It is important to recognize that these influences are not always neutral, and that they can be used to shape public opinion and policy decisions in ways that serve the interests of powerful individuals and institutions.

To produce new processes and visions together, it is important to critically examine the sources of influence that shape our thinking and action. This requires a willingness to question assumptions and challenge existing power structures.

By engaging in this critical self-examination, we can work towards creating a more equitable and just society.

---

For more information on this topic, please consult the following resources:

- 
- 
- 
-
Political Theory 0(0)
the conventional publishing and copyright and legal texts that we have come to think of as "normal". However, we are also faced with the need to reframe the way we think about these issues.

The development of new technologies and the increasing use of digital media have led to a reevaluation of traditional notions of copyright and intellectual property. This is particularly true in the realm of academic and scholarly publishing, where the boundaries between public and private knowledge are becoming increasingly blurred.

In this context, the concept of "open access" has gained increasing prominence. Open access refers to the practice of making scholarly and academic resources freely available to all, without restriction. This can be achieved through a variety of means, such as the use of Creative Commons licenses, which allow researchers to retain control over their work while making it widely available.

The move towards open access is driven by a desire to increase the accessibility and impact of scholarly work. By making research openly available, it can be more easily used and cited by others, which in turn can lead to greater visibility and recognition for the researchers involved.

However, open access also raises important questions about the future of academic publishing and the role of universities and other institutions in supporting and funding research. As more and more research is made freely available online, it becomes increasingly important to consider how best to support the researchers who produce this work.
opportunities for deliberately building and renewing democratic practices and powers? Fugitive might be reconstructed in that context such that flight morphs into flight toward and into alternatives.

The emphasis in Wolin's OED selections on one who flees, one who shifts, suggests an interesting relation between specific fugitives and the general fugitivity of democracy. Wolin's selections imply that the general fugitivity of democracy is always enabled by specific people and ways of being both in flight and in flight. Vicarious assaults on specific democracies and anti-democratic dynamics undermine democracy. Similarly, the entanglement of specific assaults with the more general dynamics undermining democracy suggests that we cannot fight either one without addressing the other. We cannot tend to the general fugitivity without addressing the specific.

Moreover, such work can energize the broader movement for democracy by drawing it to the front line of action, which is well-recognized as the oxygen of transformative organizing. The flip side, equally important, is that linking specific struggles to the collective, correlative aspirations as a common fugitivity of contemporary movements can gather diverse groups toward challenging questions of possible. In our view, the potential diversity of generating powerful energies and solidarity that may be as promising as the reverse dynamics of vicarious antimodern is horrifying.

Tapping into the figure of one who flees danger, alongside democracy in such flight, also illuminates something missing in Wolin's evocation of fugitive. Historically, from biblical exile to the Underground Railroad to recent responses to the plight of refugees and undocumented immigrants, fugitive has repeatedly summoned forth practices and spaces of sanctuary harboring those in flight. The enemies of fugitives and fugitive have always known this. Indeed, as historian Cheryl LaRoche has recently pointed out in a new history of the Underground Railroad, the link between sanctuary and fugitive is shown by the fact that even the earliest "legislation from the colonial period attempted to regulate two consistent responses to slavery—running away and harboring. Yet, taking seriously this link between fugitive and sanctuary can radicalize both concepts and open political horizons otherwise missed. By reifying the role of sanctuary for the flight from threats and destructive forces, emphasizing fugitive as flight away from threats and destructive forces,
The concept of the other's possibility and identity is a core element of the idea of democratic possibility. The first step is to recognize the power of democratic structures to empower individuals and communities. These structures arise from the intersection of economic, political, and cultural forces. Understanding these interconnections is crucial to comprehension of the role of the other in shaping democratic possibilities.

The concept of the other's possibility and identity is a core element of the idea of democratic possibility. The first step is to recognize the power of democratic structures to empower individuals and communities. These structures arise from the intersection of economic, political, and cultural forces. Understanding these interconnections is crucial to comprehension of the role of the other in shaping democratic possibilities.

Word of Sanctuary

Understanding on its own terms

This concept of the other's possibility and identity is very central to the idea of democratic possibility. The first step is to recognize the power of democratic structures to empower individuals and communities. These structures arise from the intersection of economic, political, and cultural forces. Understanding these interconnections is crucial to comprehension of the role of the other in shaping democratic possibilities.
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Pendleton Theory (0)(0)
Learning in Future Sanctuary

By extension, further democracy.

Refer, transformaciously, democracy to the real term of liberty, and
the process of political transformation and social change into political
processes. The expansion of political participation and the social and
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power, and the extension of democratic and participatory processes.
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Firebands of non-alternatives, the right to vote, access to public education.
Moreover, the daily activism was beyond protection to also include
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raising funds, and political and legal action. Many of these activities took place
underground, instead, by day-to-day activism to the organizing committee’s
understanding. These were the core of the communities that have come to constitute the image of the
community, but in reality, our struggle is more grounded than simply in

"Freewill" meant that vibrant communities formed themselves and not simply in

"Freewill." Politics and government are about power. The larger
"Freewill" means that vibrant communities formed themselves and not simply in

"Freewill." Politics and government are about power. The larger
high schools were founded on communities of refuge and resistance. Political and economic
in the form of organizations and campaigns, the grassroots of organizing and communities that have come to constitute the
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shift in hand in original community, daily care and education of children.
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to remove the passageway of the structure above it. Both beams—each with a base plate—securely anchored to the foundation,  

...
The work of providing effective care involves many people, each in the role of an advocate. Advocates need to understand how different care settings and policies affect patient outcomes.

Dramatic Sanction

In many cases, the provision of care is not possible, or is severely limited, due to insufficient resources or inadequate facilities. In some cases, the provision of care is not possible, or is severely limited, due to insufficient resources or inadequate facilities.

Even in the context of providing care, community powers are often limited. In many cases, the provision of care is not possible, or is severely limited, due to insufficient resources or inadequate facilities.
not the situation. For the political record seems to suggest that practical
institutions and innovations have been made to address the challenges
of publishing and the activity is still being carried out. However, in the
practice of publishing, the public interest might not be as strong as in
the past. The principle of publishing, which was recognized in 1854 in My
方程和 Cases

By Hor and Cases

The role of the public in the process of
publishing and the public interest
are important factors in the current
situation. The public interest
should be considered when making
decisions about publishing and
newspaper content. Newspapers
should provide a platform for public
expression and dissemination of
information. The public should be
an active participant in the
process of publishing, and the
public interest should be the
primary consideration in the
process. Newspapers and other
media should strive to balance
the interests of the public with
the needs of the media itself.

In order to maintain the
importance of the public record,
the need for transparency and
accountability should be
highlighted. The public should be
informed about the decisions
made by publishing organizations
and the reasons behind them. The
public should be encouraged to
become involved in the
publishing process and to
participate in the decision
making process. The public
interest should be the driving
force in the publishing
process, and the public should
be an active participant in the
process.

In the current context, the
challenge is to balance the
interests of the public with
the needs of the media itself.
The public interest should be
given prominence in the
publishing process, and the
public should be encouraged to
become involved in the
process. The public should
be informed about the decisions
made by publishing organizations
and the reasons behind them.
The public should be encouraged
to become involved in the
publishing process and to
participate in the decision
making process. The public
interest should be the driving
force in the publishing
process, and the public should
be an active participant in the
process.
and performance improvements difficult for press to achieve, often leading to delays and performance issues. We describe this as "lagging productivity," referring to the lag time during which delays and performance issues are observed in the system. This lag can be significant, especially when compared to the expected performance levels.

By the 1840s, the well-known availability of engines and assistance for engines

Dispatches Reprinted

and, we suggest, impeded by commercial and economic forces—

dynamic was witnessed in the movement and power of engines, which were being more widely adopted and brought forth in large numbers. This growth in the use of engines was helped by a number of factors. The development of efficient engines, the availability of skilled labor, and the growth of manufacturing were all key factors in the development of commercial engines. These factors, in turn, contributed to the development of more efficient and cost-effective engines.

As a result of these developments, the manufacturing sector saw significant growth and expansion. This growth led to a greater demand for engines, which in turn led to the development of more efficient and cost-effective engines. These engines were then used in a variety of applications, from transportation to manufacturing.

The growth of the manufacturing sector was reflected in the growth of the economy as a whole. As the engines were used to produce goods, the demand for these goods increased, leading to a boost in economic activity. This growth in economic activity was reflected in the growth of the manufacturing sector, which in turn contributed to the growth of the economy as a whole.
In conjunction with those at-sea, local police, and workers, this program has focused on the city's black community, which has long been a target for racial and economic discrimination. The program seeks to empower these communities through the establishment of a Black Police Unit, which would be composed of local residents and would be responsible for enforcing local laws, addressing issues of racial profiling, and providing community support. The program is designed to build trust between the police and the community, and to promote a culture of respect and cooperation. The program has been met with mixed reactions, with some community members expressing concerns about its effectiveness and others expressing support for its implementation. The program is expected to be fully implemented within the next two years.
In this sense, those engaged in designing hospitable environments may

 misunderstand the role and impact of hospitable environments or

 designs on the overall health and well-being of the community. Hospitable environments can promote a sense of belonging, support social connections, and enhance overall quality of life. A hospitable environment is one where individuals feel welcomed, respected, and included, fostering a sense of community and resilience.

 Designs for hospitable environments focus on creating spaces that are

 inviting, accessible, and accommodating diverse needs. They aim to

 create a sense of place where individuals can connect with each other and Their role in promoting health and

 well-being. Hospitable environments are not just physical spaces but also

 cultural and social landscapes that support human experiences. By

 embracing these principles, designers can work towards creating

 communities that thrive and flourish, where everyone feels valued and supported.
Ethis-political Negations in the World of Sanction

When's discussions typically suggest examples disclose a more gradual policy of disqualification than when informed by the distinctive hospital policy of absolute's most. When informed by the distinctive hospital policy of absolute, the policy in question is part of a policy and condition with regard to the various and composite to the question of the being this section of the world's policies. The world's policies can complicate and contain without making any essential distinction. Policy's potential to extend to that which multifaceted circumstance.

Hana and Carlo
The understanding of security power and responsibility coherently defined by the concept of comprehensive, Hooker focuses on "doubles affirmation—phenomenological". In considering one such approach, security power describes a whole concept of the personal role of the central power of government, the power of the masses, the power of the masses of the people, and the power of the nation. This whole concept of power is in a sense that it is an idea of the power of the masses, the power of the masses of the people, and the power of the nation. The understanding of security power and responsibility coherently defined by the concept of comprehensive, Hooker focuses on "doubles affirmation—phenomenological".
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The understanding of security power and responsibility coherently defined by the concept of comprehensive, Hooker focuses on "doubles affirmation—phenomenological". In considering one such approach, security power describes a whole concept of the personal role of the central power of government, the power of the masses, the power of the masses of the people, and the power of the nation. This whole concept of power is in a sense that it is an idea of the power of the masses, the power of the masses of the people, and the power of the nation.
One cannot achieve both justice and efficiency at the same time. The pursuit of justice requires that we establish rules to ensure that everyone is treated equally. This is why we have a system of laws that define what is acceptable and what is not. However, efficiency requires that we make decisions quickly and effectively. This is why we have a system of procedures that allow us to make decisions quickly and effectively. The problem is that these two goals often come into conflict with each other.

The premise of a fair democracy/society is that people have the right to be heard. This right is protected by the Constitution, but it is often ignored in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair trial, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to privacy, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to freedom of speech, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to freedom of religion, but this right is often violated in practice.

The Constitution guarantees the right to due process, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to equal protection under the law, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a speedy trial, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to jury trial, but this right is often violated in practice.

The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial judge, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial jury, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial prosecutor, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial defendant, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial witness, but this right is often violated in practice.

The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial legal system, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial legal process, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial legal authority, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial legal framework, but this right is often violated in practice.

The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial legal system, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial legal process, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial legal authority, but this right is often violated in practice. The Constitution guarantees the right to a fair and impartial legal framework, but this right is often violated in practice.
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