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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this manual is to aid teachers using Mark C. Carnes and John A. Garraty, *The American Nation*, as the basic text in survey courses. For each of the 33 chapters, the Instructor's Manual provides these features:

**Chapter Overview**: a summary of each section of the chapter divided by the same headings used in the text.

**Points for Mastery**: main points covered by the text that students should master. Converted into question form, these may be used as essay questions.

**Points for Further Discussion**: questions that go beyond the material presented in the text. Students should be able to answer these questions based on the information in the text, even though the answer is not specifically found in the text itself.

**Lecture Supplement**: brief essays providing information on topics either mentioned in the text and not developed or on topics related to information included in the text. They are designed to supplement lectures or to be developed into full lectures themselves. Toward the latter end, each lecture supplement includes a bibliography. Many of the topics included in the lecture supplements are designed to go beyond the subjects covered in the text; some present different interpretations from those found in the text.

**Documents**: two or more documents relating to a single topic. The documents are introduced and put into context in a brief introductory section. Like the lecture topics, the document sections are designed to take students and teachers beyond the subjects covered in the text or to amplify subjects included in the text. Each packet of documents includes a set of questions designed to focus attention on the main issues presented by the documents. Many of the document packets focus on the experiences of ordinary people, minorities, family issues, gender issues, and related topics. These documents can be used as classroom exercises, as essay assignments, as take-home exams, as lecture supplements, or as the basis for full lectures. The introductory passage contains bibliographical references to aid in the use of developing these document packets into lectures.

The Instructor's Manual has been designed to meet the needs of both the novice and the more experienced instructor. Beginning instructors often need lecture material more than anything else. Not only do the lecture supplements provide that, but the document packets are designed to help in that regard as well. More experienced instructors may be less familiar with some of the subjects covered in the lecture supplements and documents packets. These sections provide the means to incorporate new material into lectures or to develop lectures on new topics. More experienced instructors may also wish to use the documents as means of testing students' analytical skills or presenting issues to students in new ways. In any case, the Instructor's Manual is designed to provide additional information and to amplify the material found in the text. It also intends to suggest different ways of approaching the material in survey courses.

Michael S. Mayer
CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Passage to Alaska. Although human beings emerged in Africa more than two million years ago, the peoples who most resemble modern humans appeared approximately 50,000 B.C. These people developed tools, such as stone-tipped spears and harpoons, as well as bone fishhooks and needles. They also devised complex languages.

Approximately 20,000 years ago, and perhaps far earlier, hunters, following the large mammals they hunted, migrated first to Siberia and then across the Bering Strait to Alaska. They followed the game east and then south to the Great Plains, which teemed with animals.

The Demise of the Big Mammals. The large mammals of the Great Plains evolved in the absence of human beings. They had no natural fear of the small creatures, but weapons made humans formidable hunters. In addition, the climate was warming, and the grasslands that sustained the large mammals shrank. By about 9000 B.C., nearly three-quarters of the species of large mammals of North America had become extinct. Historians debate whether climate or hunting was primarily responsible for the extinction of the large mammals, but the fact remains that their extinction coincided with the appearance of humans. In any event, the absence of large mammals had a profound effect on the subsequent course of human events.

The Archaic Period: A World Without Big Mammals, 9000 B.C.-1000 B.C. The absence of large mammals led to the destruction of Clovis culture. Their descendants had to find new sources of food, clothing, and shelter. This time, known as the Archaic period, lasted several hundred human generations. Life during this time was harsh; drought or a severe winter could lead to starvation. People of the Archaic period were hunters who adapted themselves to a particular habitat. In woodland areas east of the Mississippi River, they hunted small animals and larger species, such as elk and deer. On the Great Plains, they preyed upon bison, which could be stampeded over cliffs. Most groups of people migrated from place to place according to a seasonal schedule in search of food.

As Archaic people became more knowledgeable about food sources, they traveled less frequently. In addition, goods passed from one band to another through a remarkably far-ranging trading system. Further, they began to cultivate plants, although hunting and foraging remained the primary sources of food.

The First Sedentary Communities, 1000 B.C. Some archaic peoples found unusually rich habitats that could sustain them throughout the year. Coastal and riverine peoples of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska subsisted on fish. Those living along the New England coast depended on a seemingly inexhaustible supply of shellfish. As tribes remained longer in one area, they began to regard it as their own. They built more substantial places to live and buried their dead with distinctive rituals in special places. Some tribes became sufficiently
proficient at acquiring food to allow significant building projects, such as the mounds of the Mississippi River floodplains or the Mississippi and Ohio River valleys. Other mound-building societies flourished in what is now Ohio and Illinois. None of these communities lasted more than a few hundred years, which suggests the fragility of sedentary life. The transition from hunting and gathering to a society based on settled agriculture was slow and uneven.

**Corn Transforms the Southwest.** About two thousand years ago, when most of the peoples of North America were grouped in hunting bands, an urban civilization flourished in the central Mexican highlands. The population of Teotihuacan, the largest city of the Aztecs, approached 100,000. The Aztecs built a pyramid as large as those of Egypt. Another civilization, the Incan, also built cities and pyramids. The cultivation of corn accounted for the difference between the simpler peoples to the north and the classic civilizations of Mesoamerica.

The crop eventually reached people of what is now the southwestern United States. Corn transformed the lives of these people. Communities settled near rivers, built canals to channel water to the crops, and dammed gullies to collect run-off water from flash floods. They constructed substantial houses near the corn fields. Their culture revolved around corn; sun and water became the focus of their religious beliefs. Despite the aridity and heat of the Southwest, the population of corn-cultivating peoples increased. Although these communities never approached the size of Aztec cities, the Anasazi, for example, carved villages into cliffs and linked them with an elaborate system of roads.

**The Diffusion of Corn.** The cultivation of corn spread from the Southwest to the East. Cold weather initially limited the expansion of the crop to the north. Moreover, farming was hard work; and hunters, who were accustomed to the thrill of the hunt and the taste of game, regarded farming as a subsidiary activity, best relegated to women. Still, agriculture continued to spread.

**Population Growth After 800 A.D.** Corn stimulated population growth. An acre of woodlands fed two or three hunters; that same acre planted in corn provided for as many as two hundred people. Hunters and foragers could normally find enough to eat in summer and fall, but winter brought the threat of starvation. Corn, however, could be dried and stored in glazed pots or sealed in underground pits. It could sustain substantial numbers of people over long periods. Thus, communities that cultivated corn were less likely to starve. They also had more children. Further, farming was more conducive to the survival of children. Communities that cultivated corn responded to the increasing population by clearing more woodland and planting more corn. Initially, farming groups and hunting groups coexisted comfortably. A mutually advantageous trading system developed, whereby hunters traded for corn and farmers traded for game. Over time, however, the two groups often came into conflict. When they did, the more numerous corn cultivators prevailed. The cultivation of
corn spread over much of North America. Farming communities shared a constellation of beliefs and rituals. Some villages grew into towns and even small cities, which became home to temples and granaries as well as the homes of the governing elite.

**Cahokia: The Hub of Mississippian Culture.** The most important such community was Cahokia (near St. Louis), a major center of trade, shops, crafts, and religious, as well as political activities. Comprising a series of mounds, the largest of which was nearly 100 feet high, the city, at its height, had about 15,000 inhabitants. The Cahokian society was characterized by sharp class divisions. Although impressively fortified, the city was primarily a religious and cultural center. Although the city's ruling elite did not command a large army, it dominated a region of several hundred miles.

**The Collapse of Urban Centers.** For all its power, Cahokia and comparable settlements declined. By 1200, Cahokia's population had fallen to several thousand people; by 1350 it was deserted. Other mound-building communities declined somewhat later. Major settlements of the Southwest civilizations dwindled as well. Scholars have long debated the cause of the collapse of these communities. Some cite protracted droughts during the 1200s and 1300s; others argue that population growth damaged the environment. Scholars also disagree about what happened to the cities. Some believe that people left the cities and reverted to hunting and foraging. Others maintain that cataclysmic warfare and social upheaval ended these civilizations. The collapse of cities disrupted trade networks, and the flow of trade contracted. However, some goods continued to be traded over long distances. Social units became smaller, and these units lived in relative isolation.

**American Beginnings in Eurasia and Africa.** The Neolithic revolution made only fitful progress in North America by 1500, but by that date it had transformed Eurasia and Africa. The domestication of wheat began in Southwest Asia around 9000 B.C. It expanded through the Nile Valley and the Mediterranean. From there, it spread eastward to India and China. The cultivation of rice began in China about the same time as the earliest cultivation of wheat. Rice cultivation spread throughout Eurasia. Other crops came under cultivation. The flow of people and crops between Eurasia and Africa slowed after about 3000 B.C., when the climate of Africa shifted and the Sahara expanded into a vast and nearly impenetrable desert. In addition to crops, the ancient peoples of Eurasia learned to domesticate horses, pigs, cows, goats, sheep, and oxen. These animals furnished meat and many services. Cows and goats also provided milk, which could be made into cheese (a product that could be stored). Horses and oxen helped clear fields and pulled ploughs through tough sod. Animals also provided manure for fertilizer.

The diversity and quality of its food sources enabled the Eurasian population to increase rapidly. As cities developed, farmers cut down forests, filled in marshlands, and terraced hillsides to accommodate the growing demand for food. An elaborate system of trade developed, as did port facilities and fleets of ships.

As crops and animals spread over the Eurasian landmass, so did new diseases. Trade and concentrations of people contributed to the spread of disease. Recurrent plagues swept across Eurasia; those who survived acquired biological resistance.

West Africa evolved differently. The grassy savanna south of the Sahara became the
home for herding peoples. Cities emerged as a result of the trans-Sahara trade. This trade also gave rise to conflicts, which led to the emergence of great kingdoms. People of the coastal region, protected by tropical forests, grew crops and harvested the produces of the forest.

**Europe in Ferment.** Europe's population increased rapidly during the fifteenth century. When harvests were poor or grain shipments failed to arrive, hunger destabilized the political order. Shortages of land caused many peasants to head for cities. New ideas further unsettled European society. Movable type made the printing of books profitable. Books advanced new ideas and weakened the hold of traditional ones. Struggles over land led to advances in the military arts. By the end of the fifteenth century, Europe was in ferment.

Five hundred years earlier, a Norseman, Leif Ericson, had crossed the Atlantic Ocean and sailed along the shores of Labrador. Little came of his ventures, but sailors of the late fifteenth century bridged the expanses of the Atlantic. In doing so, they would link Europe, North America, and sub-Saharan Africa in ways that would profoundly change all of them.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The human migration to North America
2. The role of humans in the extinction of large mammals in North America.
3. The emergence of sedentary communities.
4. The importance of corn in development of civilizations in the western hemisphere.
5. The reasons for the collapse of urban centers in North America.
6. The role domesticated plants, such as wheat and rice, played in the development of civilizations in Eurasia and Africa.
7. How animals contributed to the development of civilizations in Eurasia and Africa.
8. The forces that unsettled European societies in the fifteenth century.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Discuss the impact the use of tools had in the development of human societies in North America during the Archaic period.

2. Why did urban centers prove more lasting in Eurasia than in North America?

3. What current political or ideological considerations might underlie the debate over the extinctions of the large mammals discussed in the “Debating the Past” section?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

In recent years, historians have paid much more attention to the role ecological issues have played in human history. For example, the textbook mentions the impact of the arrival of humans in North America. Hunters of the archaic period at the very least contributed to an extinction of large mammals that included over thirty genera, including mammoths and mastodons, horses, camelids, tapir, ground sloths, and sabertooth cats. These animals evolved in an environment without human hunters and thus were vulnerable to human predation. They probably did not fear the small (human) creatures and, in any event, had few defenses against hunters. Moreover, as a result of their evolution in an environment without human predators, these creatures had long gestation periods, which made it difficult for populations to rebound from losses to human hunting. Finally, scholars argue that archaic-era hunters went after female and juvenile animals (which were smaller, had softer hides, and so on), and this had a disproportionate impact on the animal populations.

Among the victims of this mass extinction was a larger species of bison that became extinct approximately 10,000 B.C. A smaller species of bison with a greater reproductive capacity (a species that still exists in North America) moved into a number of vacant ecological niches and multiplied in number. Thus, the vast herds of bison encountered first by Plains Indians and then by Europeans were the product of the Pleistocene extinctions.

However, estimates of the size of the bison herds on the Great Plains, based on the estimates of awed observers in the nineteenth century, have generally been exaggerated. In all likelihood, there were never 100 million or even 60 million bison on the Great Plains in the nineteenth century. In a seminal article in The Journal of American History, Dan Flores has estimated that the bison population on the Great Plains was more likely in the range of 28-30 million. In addition, analysis of pollen and archaeological data indicate that there were periods, some lasting decades and some lasting centuries, when bison were virtually absent from the Southern Plains. Two of those intervals occurred between 5000 and 2500 B.C. and 500 and 1300 A.D. Scholars have drawn these conclusions based on the absence of bison bones in archaeological levels and on corresponding pollen data that indicate periods of
drought. The Southwest suffered a severe drought from roughly 500 to the early fourteenth century. It was followed by a five-hundred-year period of wetter and cooler conditions, during which time the bison returned to the Southern Plains.

Flores estimates that human pressures on the bison population began to accelerate even before Europeans came to the Americas. The arrival of Europeans and the reintroduction of the horse, however, transformed tribal life on the Great Plains. The same extinctions that had created ecological niches for the bison enabled horses to reoccupy niches they had once occupied and spread across the Plains. Mounted hunting remade tribal life and enabled Plains Indians to exploit the resource of the bison herds. Eventually, this process was furthered by the introduction of European technology in the form of firearms. Not only did Indian populations grow, but the use of goods derived from bison (such as hides) in trade led to even greater exploitation of bison herds as a resource.

Thus, long before railroads and the relatively sophisticated firearms of the nineteenth century, humans influenced the environment and inflicted ecological damage.

An article in the November 26, 2004, issue of *Science* magazine called into question the so-called overkill theory. The authors of the article maintained that climate change, not human hunting, accounted for the reduction of bison populations. The paper identified a decrease in genetic diversity among bison that coincided with a cooling trend beginning between 32,000 and 42,000 years ago. This was 15,000 years before the first significant migration of humans entered the archaeological record. The authors concluded that “some component of these ecological changes [the colder and drier climate] may have been sufficient to stress bison populations.” Proponents of the overkill thesis remain unconvinced and argue that the reduction of bison herds to near-extinction would not have happened without hunting by humans.

The debate regarding the fate of the bison and other megafauna continues, fueled by new research and political positions of researchers.

Two important developments provided incentives for European exploration. First, Europe's population grew significantly in the fifteenth century. The Black Death had devastated Europe's population in the mid-fourteenth century, but, 150 years later, Europe's population had rebounded. The expanding population meant increasing land values, a general increase of prosperity, and an expansion of commerce. Growing trade led to advances in shipbuilding and navigation, which made long sea voyages more feasible. The search for new goods and markets provided a powerful impetus to exploration. Second, with the rise of nation-states, European monarchs had the power, wealth, and desire to sponsor explorations that would develop trade and further enrich them and their countries.

Moreover, Muslim control over the trade routes to the east resulted in rising prices of eastern goods. At the same time, however, the Islamic world was not a significant sea power. Portugal and Spain, which had struggled for a long time against Muslims in the Mediterranean, had incentives to seek trade routes by sea to the east. Further, long and bitter wars with the Moors had contributed to religious fervor among the Iberians. Christopher Columbus, for example, recited vespers every evening, led his crew in religious observances, and (although he never took monastic vows) sometimes wore the habit of a Franciscan monk.

This background contributed to Columbus's perceptions of the territory he encountered. When he sighted land on October 12, 1492, he believed that he had reached Asia. Three more voyages across the Atlantic did not shake his conviction. Indeed, when Columbus died in 1505, he remained unaware that he had reached a world previously unknown to Europeans. This was not the result of mere stubbornness or self-delusion on the great navigator's part. The islands of the Caribbean that he encountered appeared similar to the islands off the coast of Asia that appeared on medieval maps.

The first document, a letter from Columbus to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, reveals much about the mariner's perceptions of the New World, his ambitions, and his religious views. The Spanish court suppressed the letter and later circulated a censored version that omitted the discussion of how the riches from the New World would contribute to retaking Jerusalem from the Muslims ("for which purpose this enterprise was undertaken"). The original of the letter remained lost or ignored in Spanish archives for almost five hundred years.

Though similar in general, the forces behind English exploration differed in some particulars. Henry VII came to the throne after more than three decades of dynastic conflict known as the Wars of the Roses. He quickly set about establishing a stable financial foundation for his reign. He also created more efficient structures of government. Henry also encouraged trade, and, as part of that effort, granted a patent to search for a westward route to China to an Italian sailor, John Cabot. That patent, granted in 1496, is the second document. A Genoese who became a naturalized Venetian (in the following document, Henry VII refers to him as a "citizen of Venice"), Cabot resided in the British port of Bristol. Cabot
and his three sons set sail in 1497. He found neither a more direct route to Asia nor the cities and markets Henry VII expected. However, Cabot established England's first claims in the Americas.

The third document is Amerigo Vespucci's account of his voyage to Lorenzo Pietro Di Medici. Vespucci, after whom the two continents of the western hemisphere were named, presented a marked contrast to Columbus. Born into obscurity, Columbus aggressively sought fame and wealth. In contrast, Vespucci was born into a noble family in Florence; his writings scarcely mention the search for gold (which made him highly unusual, if not unique, for explorers of his age). Columbus led an expedition, whereas Vespucci sailed as a navigator, observer, and scientist.

Vespucci had previously served the Medici family, and in a letter to a member of that family, Lorenzo Pietro Di Medici, Vespucci asserted that he had sailed not to Asia, but to a new world. Perhaps Vespucci's realization was why later mapmakers referred to the new world as America. Vespucci's letter is the third document.


**Questions for Discussion**

1. For what reasons did Columbus undertake his voyage? In what ways do Columbus's letter reveal his purposes for sailing?

2. Compare Columbus's reasons for undertaking his voyage with those that can be discerned from the patent Henry VII granted to John Cabot.

3. How does Columbus's description of the natives compare with that of Vespucci? What common impressions are there? What do these observations reveal about the Europeans who made them?
Christopher Columbus, Letter To The Sovereigns (1493)

Most Christian and lofty and powerful sovereigns:

That eternal God who has given Your Highnesses so many victories now gave you the greatest one that to this day He has ever given any prince. I come from the Indies with the armada Your Highnesses gave me, to which [place] I traveled...I found innumerable people and very many islands, of which I took possession in Your Highnesses' name, by royal crier and with Your Highnesses' royal banner unfurled, and it was not contradicted. To the first [island] I gave the name of San Salvador, in memory of His Supreme Majesty, to the second Santa María de la Concepción, to the third Fernandina, to the fourth Isabela, to the fifth Juana....After I arrived at Juana I followed its coast to the west and found it to be so large that I thought it was probably not an island, but rather a mainland, and most likely the province of Cathay [China]; but I could not verify this because everywhere I arrived the people fled and I could not speak with them. And because I was unable to find a notable settlement, I thought that by hugging the coast I could not fail to find some town or great city...In the meantime, I already understood something of the speech and signs of certain Indians I had taken on the island of San Salvador, and I understood [from them] that this was still an island. And thus I came to a very good harbor, from which I sent two men inland, three days' journey, with one of the Indians I brought, who had become friendly with me, so that they could see and determine if there were any cities or large settlements, and which land it was, and what there was in it. They found many settlements and innumerable people, but no government of any importance....And thus I followed the sea coast of this island toward the east one hundred and seven leagues to where it ended. And before leaving it, I saw another island to the east, eighteen leagues out from this one, which I later named Española....So I went on in this fashion until the sixteenth of January, when I determined to return to Your Highnesses, as much because I had already found most of what I sought as because I had only one caravel left....

Besides the above-mentioned islands, I have found many others in the Indies, of which I have not been able to tell in this letter. They, like these others, are so extremely fertile, that even if I were able to express it, it would not be a marvel were it to be disbelieved. The breezes [are] most temperate, the trees and fruits and grasses are extremely beautiful and very different from ours...All these islands are densely populated with the best people under he sun; they have neither ill-will nor treachery. All of them, women and men alike, go about naked as their mothers bore them, although some of the women wear a small piece of cotton or a patch of grass with which they cover themselves. They have neither iron nor weapons, except for canes on the end of which they place a thin sharp stick. Everything they make is done with [stone tools]. And I have not learned that any of them have any private property...

Nowhere in these islands have I known the inhabitants to have a religion or idolatry, or much diversity of language among them, but rather they all understand one another. I learned that they know that all powers reside in heaven....

Now, most serene sovereigns, remember that I left my woman and children behind and came from my homeland to serve you, in which I spent what I had. And I spent seven years of my time and put up with a thousand indignities and disgrace and I suffered much hardship. I did not wish to deal with other princes who solicited me, although Your Highnesses' giving
of your protection to this voyage has owed more to my importuning than to anything else. And not only has no favor been shown to me, but moreover, nothing of what was promised to me has been fulfilled. I do not ask favors of Your Highnesses in order to amass treasure, for I have no purpose other than to serve God and Your Highnesses, and to bring this business of the Indies to perfection, as time will be my witness. And therefore I beseech you that honor be bestowed upon me according to my service.

The Church of God should also work for this: providing prelates and devout and wise religious; and because the matter is so great and of such a character, there is reason for the Holy Father to provide prelates who are very free of greed for temporal possessions and very true to the service of God and of Your Highnesses. And therefore I beseech you to ask the Church in the letter you write regarding this victory, for a cardinalate for my son...
Henry VII, Letters Patent Granted To John Cabot (1496)

The King, to all whom, etc. Greeting: Be it known and made manifest that we have given and granted as by these presents we give and grant, for us and our heir, to our well-beloved John Cabot, citizen of Venice, and to Lewis, Sebastian and Sancio, sons of the said John, and to the heirs and deputys of them, and of any one of them, full and free authority, faculty and power to said to all parts, regions and coasts of the eastern, western and northern sea, under our banners, flags and ensigns, five ships or vessels of whatsoever burden and quality they may be and with so many and with such mariners and men as they may wish to take with them in the said ships, at their own proper costs and charges, to find, discover and investigate whatsoever islands, countries, regions or provinces of heathens and infidels, in whatsoever part of the world placed, which before this time were unknown to all Christians. We have also granted them and to any of them, and to the heirs and deputys of them and any one of them, and have given license to set up our aforesaid banners and ensigns in any town, city, castle, island or mainland whatsoever, newly found by them. And that the before-mentioned John and his sons or their heirs and deputys may conquer, occupy and possess whatsoever such towns, castles, cities and island by them thus discovered that they may be able to conquer, occupy and possess, as our vassals and governors lieutenants and deputys therein, acquiring for us the dominion, title and jurisdiction of the same towns, castles, cities, islands and mainlands so discovered; in such a way nevertheless that of all the fruits, profits, emoluments, commodities, gains and revenues accruing from this voyage, the said John and sons and their heirs and deputys shall be bounded and under obligation for every voyage, as often as they shall arrive at our port of Bristol, at which they are bound and holden only to arrive, all necessary charges and expenses incurred by them having been deducted, to pay us, either in gold or money, the fifth part of the whole capital gained...[however] they should be free and exempt from all payment of customs on all and singular goods and merchandise that they may bring back with them from those places thus newly discovered.

And further we have given and granted to them and to their heirs and deputys, that all mainlands, islands, towns, cities, castles and other places whatsoever discovered by them, however numerous they may happen to be, may not be frequented or visited by any other subjects of ours whatsoever without the license of the aforementioned John and his sons and of their deputys, on point of the loss as well of the ships or vessels daring to sail to these places discovered, as of all goods whatsoever. Willing and strictly commanding all singular our subjects as well by land as by sea that they shall render good assistance to the aforesaid John and his sons and deputys and that they shall give them all their favor and help as well as in fitting out the ships or vessels as in buying stores and provisions with their money and in providing the other things which they must take with them on the said voyage.
Amerigo Vespucci, Letter to Lorenzo Pietro di Medici

On a former occasion I wrote to you at some length concerning my return from those new regions which we found and explored with the fleet, at the cost, and by the command of this Most Serene King of Portugal. And these we may rightly call a new world. Because our ancestors had no knowledge of them, and it will be a matter wholly new to all those who hear about them. For this transcends the view held by our ancients, inasmuch as most of them hold that there is no continent to the south beyond the equator, but only the sea which they named the Atlantic; and if some of them did aver that a continent there was, they denied with abundant argument that it was a habitable land. But that this their opinion is false and utterly opposed to the truth, this my last voyage has made manifest; for in those southern parts I have found a continent more densely peopled and abounding in animals than our Europe or Asia or Africa, and, in addition, a climate milder and more delightful than in any other region known to us...

But during these tempests of sea and sky, so numerous and so violent, the Most High was pleased to display before us a continent, new lands, and an unknown world....We knew that land to be a continent and not an island both because it stretches forth in the form of a very long and unbending coast, and because it is replete with infinite inhabitants....Part of this new continent lies in the torrid zone beyond the equator toward the Antarctic pole....

First then as to the people. WE found in those parts such a multitude of people as nobody could enumerate (as we read in the Apocalypse), a race I say gentle and amenable. All of both sexes go about naked, covering no part of their bodies...They have indeed large square-built bodies, well formed and proportioned, and in color verging upon reddish. This I think has come to them, because, going about naked, they are colored by the sun. They have, too hair plentiful and black....They are comely, too, of countenance which they nevertheless themselves destroy; for they bore their cheeks, lips, noses and ears. Nor think those holes small or that they have one only. For some I have seen having in a single face seven borings any one of which was capable of holding a plum. They stop up these holes of their with blue stones, bits of marble, very beautiful crystals of alabaster, very white bones, and other things artificially prepared according to their customs....[T]his usage applies to the men alone. For women do not bore their faces, but their ears only. They have another custom, very shameful and beyond all human belief. For their women, being very lustful, cause the private parts of their husbands to swell up to such a huge size that they appear deformed and disgusting; and this is accomplished by a certain device of their, the biting of certain poisonous animals....They have no cloth either of wool, linen or cotton, since they need it not; neither do they have goods of their own, but all things are held in common. They live together without king, without government, and each is his own master. They marry as many wives as they please; and son cohabits with mother, brother with sister, male cousin with female, and any man with the first woman he meets. They dissolve their marriages as often as they please, and observe no sort of law with respect to them. Beyond the fact that they have no church, no religion, and are not idolaters, what more can I say?...The nations wage war upon one another without art or order. The elders by means of certain harangues of theirs bend the youths to their will and inflame them to wars in which they cruelly kill one another, and those whom they bring home captives from war they preserve, not to spare their lives, but that they may be slain for food; for they eat one another, the victors and the vanquished, and
among other kinds of meat human flesh is a common article of diet with them....They live one hundred and fifty years, and rarely fall ill, and if they do fall victims to any disease, they cure themselves with certain roots and herbs.
CHAPTER 1

Alien Encounters: Europe in the Americas

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Columbus and the Discovery of America. A Spanish ship commanded by an Italian mariner, Cristoforo Colombo (or Christopher Columbus), reached an island in the West Indies on October 12, 1492. Although Columbus failed to grasp the true significance of the discovery (he believed that he had reached Asia), the voyage opened up a new world to exploitation by the people of Western Europe. Europeans had long valued Asian products such as spices, tropical fruits, silk, and cotton; and Columbus had hoped to find a western route to China, Japan, and the Indies, which would eliminate both the danger and expense of overland travel, as well as Italian middlemen. By the fifteenth century, western Europeans set about discovering direct routes to the East. Prince Henry of Portugal sponsored improvements in navigation and voyages of exploration. Although Columbus was not the first European to reach the western hemisphere, it was his voyage that gave rise to further explorations.

Spain's American Empire. By the time Columbus died in 1506, other captains had embarked on ventures of discovery and conquest. In 1493, the Pope had divided the non-Christian world between Spain and Portugal. Portugal concentrated on Africa, leaving the western hemisphere, except for what would eventually become Brazil, to Spain. The Spanish fanned out through the Caribbean and over large parts of the two continents that bordered it. Explorers such as Vasco Nuñez de Balboa and Ferdinand Magellan expanded geographic knowledge. Hernan Cortes and Francisco Pizarro subdued the Aztec empire in Mexico and the Inca empire in Peru. Fifty years after Columbus's first landfall, Spain held a huge American empire covering all of South America, except Brazil, and extending to the southern fringe of North America. A distinct civilization emerged in the Spanish Americas. The Spanish founded cities, set up printing presses, constructed cathedrals, and established universities.

Indians and Europeans. The Spanish and other Europeans encountered natives in the course of their voyages of exploration. Greed and cultural arrogance led them to cheat and abuse those peoples with whom they came in contact; European technological superiority, particularly in instruments of war, provided the tools of domination.

Relativity of Cultural Values. Europeans regarded the Indians as heathens because they did not worship the Christian God. In fact, most Indians were deeply religious. While some Europeans believed that the Indians were minions of Satan, or at least unworthy of becoming Christian, others, including the Spanish friars, attempted to convert them.

The notion that Indians allowed their environment to remain pristine is a myth. They hunted, fished, modified vegetation and wildlife, and otherwise exploited the environment. However, Europeans left a deeper imprint on the landscape. Native American approaches to
land and government differed greatly from those of the Europeans, which led to misunderstanding and conflict. Even in warfare, the two cultures differed significantly. Indians did not fight to possess land; they fought not so much to destroy the enemy as to display their valor, to avenge an insult, or to acquire captives. Thus, they preferred to ambush opponents and seize stragglers. If confronted by a superior force, they melted into the woods. Europeans fought in heavily armed masses with the intent to obliterate the enemy.

**Disease and Population Losses.** Native American populations declined disastrously after the arrival of Columbus. Some historians have used terms such as "holocaust" or "genocide" to describe what happened. These terms do not fit; they usually refer to the systematic destruction of entire peoples, such as the Nazi attempt to exterminate the Jews of Europe. The motivations of the Europeans who came to the Americas differed. Indeed, many colonists depended on the Indians. The Spanish needed them to work the mines, till the soil, and build roads and buildings. French traders needed them to provide furs. English settlers depended on Indians for additional food and knowledge of how to survive in North America. The Spanish practiced deliberate and extraordinary cruelty in an attempt to subjugate Indian populations. This led to a reputation for barbarity that the English and French regarded as unapproachable. In fact, the English rivaled the Spanish in that regard.

Of all the diseases Europeans brought with them to the western hemisphere, the most potent were diseases for which Indians had no immunities. These diseases devasted Indian populations.

**Spain's European Rivals.** Spain dominated exploration of the Americas during the sixteenth century, largely because it had established internal stability, whereas other countries were still torn by religious and political conflicts. Moreover, Spain seized those areas in the Americas best suited to producing quick returns. Spanish power seemed beyond challenge, but, in fact, the great empire was in trouble. Corruption, dependence on gold and silver from its colonies, and the disruption of the Catholic church undermined Spanish power.

**The Protestant Reformation.** Corruption in the form of the sale of indulgences and the luxurious lifestyles of the popes led to a challenge by reformers such as Martin Luther and John Calvin. Political and economic motives led German princes and Swiss cities to support the reformers. In England, Henry VIII's search for a male heir led him to split from Rome when the Pope refused him a divorce.

**English Beginnings in America.** Queen Elizabeth supported the explorations of English joint-stock companies and encouraged privateers, such as Sir Francis Drake, to plunder Spanish merchant shipping. She also supported schemes to colonize the New World. After Sir Humphrey Gilbert failed to found a colony in Newfoundland, his half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, landed a group of settlers on Roanoke Island in 1587. Resupply ships did not arrive until 1590, and they found no sign of the "lost colony." Angered by English attacks on his shipping, Philip II of Spain organized a great armada to invade England. The English fleet and bad weather destroyed the armada. Thereafter, Spain could not block English penetration of the New World. Queen Elizabeth, however, remained cautious. Not until after her death did
full-scale efforts to found English colonies begin, and, even then, the organizing force came from merchant capitalists, not the Crown.

**The Settlement of Virginia.** The London Company established the first permanent English settlement in America at Jamestown in 1607. The settlement almost was not permanent. Half the settlers died during the first winter because of mismanagement, ignorance of their environment, and a scarcity of people skilled in manual labor and agriculture. The London Company encouraged useless pursuits such as searching for gold rather than building a settlement. The settlement survived in part because Captain John Smith recognized the importance of building houses and raising food. Aid from Native Americans, the settlers' realization that they must produce their own food, and the introduction of tobacco as a cash crop saved the colony. James I revoked the company's charter in 1624, and Virginia became a royal colony.

"Purifying" the Church of England. Under Elizabeth I, the Church of England became the official church. Her "middle way" satisfied most people. Catholics who could not reconcile themselves left the country; others practiced their faith in private. More radical Protestants, known as Puritans, objected to the rich vestments, the use of candles, and the use of music in services. Puritans' belief in predestination also set them apart from the Anglican church. Some Puritans, later called Congregationalists, also favored autonomy for individual churches. Others, called Presbyterians, favored an organization that emanated up from the churches rather than down from the top. Puritan fears that James I leaned towards Catholicism further alienated them from the Anglican church.

Bradford and Plymouth Colony. A group of English Separatists set sail from Plymouth, England, on the *Mayflower* to settle near the northern boundary of Virginia. They landed north of their destination and decided to settle where they were. Since they were outside the jurisdiction of the London Company, they drew up the Mayflower Compact, a mutually agreed upon covenant that established a set of political rules. They elected William Bradford their first governor. With some help from Native Americans, they established a successful colony.

Winthrop and Massachusetts Bay Colony. A group of Puritans formed the Massachusetts Bay Company and obtained a grant to the area between the Charles and Merrimack rivers. They founded Boston and several other towns in 1630. The founders established an elected legislature, although voters and members of the legislature had to be members of the church. Luck, careful planning, and an influx of new settlers ensured the success of the settlements. Under Charles I, Puritans were persecuted in England, and the Great Migration of Puritans to Massachusetts Bay took place in the 1630s.

**Troublemakers: Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson.** Several groups dissented from the way the Massachusetts Bay colony was run. Roger Williams opposed the alliance of church and civil government and championed the fair treatment of Indians. Banished from the colony, he founded the town of Providence and later established the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantation. Anne Hutchinson preached that those possessed of saving grace
were exempt from rules of good behavior. The General Court charged Hutchinson with defaming the clergy, brought her to trial, and banished her. Hutchinson and her followers left Massachusetts for Rhode Island in 1637.

**Other New England Colonies.** Congregations from Massachusetts settled in the Connecticut River valley. A group headed by Reverend Thomas Hooker founded Hartford in 1636. Their instrument of government, the Fundamental Orders, did not limit voting to church members.

**French and Dutch Settlements.** England was not alone in challenging Spain's dominance in the New World. The French planted colonies in the West Indies and, through the explorations of Cartier and Champlain, laid claim to much of the Saint Lawrence River area. The Dutch also established themselves in the Caribbean and founded the colony of New Netherland in the Hudson Valley.

**Maryland and the Carolinas.** In the seventeenth century, English colonization shifted to proprietary efforts. Proprietors hoped to obtain profit and political power. Realities of life in America, however, limited both their control and their profits. Maryland, one of the first proprietary colonies, was established under a grant to the Calvert family. Lord Baltimore hoped not only to profit but to create a refuge for Catholics. Catholics remained a minority in the colony, however, and Baltimore agreed to the Toleration Act, which guaranteed freedom of religion to all Christians. A huge grant of land south of Virginia established Carolina, the proprietors of which drafted, with the help of John Locke, a plan of government called Fundamental Constitutions. Two separate societies emerged in Carolina. The one to the north was poorer and more primitive. The Charleston colony to the south developed an economy based on trade in fur and on the export of foodstuffs. Eventually the two colonies were formally separated.

**The Middle Colonies.** The British eventually ousted the Dutch from New Amsterdam, which became New York. Quakers settled in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, where they drafted an extremely liberal constitution that guaranteed settlers freedom of conscience. William Penn, proprietor of Pennsylvania, treated the Indians fairly and permitted freedom of worship to all who believed in God. Penn's ideas were more paternalistic than democratic.

**Indians and Europeans as "Americanizers."** The relationship between Native Americans and Europeans is best characterized as an interaction. Indians taught the colonists how to grow food, what to wear, and new forms of transportation. Native Americans adopted European technology (especially weapons), clothing, and alcohol. Out of the interaction between cultures came something new and distinctively American.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The forces that drove Europeans to exploration.
2. Why England was relatively slow to explore and to settle the New World.
3. European beliefs and attitudes that governed their relations with Native Americans.
5. The impact of disease on Native American populations.
6. Why the terms "holocaust" and "genocide" do not necessarily apply to European relations with Native Americans.
7. Why private exploration was prominent in England and what the consequences were.
9. What a proprietary colony was.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. How did the realities of the New World affect the plans of colonizers?
2. What kinds of conditions caused Europeans to undertake a dangerous voyage and settle in an unknown and dangerous wilderness? How does their decision reflect on life in Europe?
3. What does Tisquantum’s experience indicate about European attitudes toward Native Americans? In what ways did he reflect and participate in “the Columbian exchange” discussed in the Lecture Supplement?
4. Why have historians devoted so much time and effort to determining the Indian population at the time of first contact with the Europeans?
LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The text discusses the "interaction" between Native Americans and Europeans. The exchange went beyond culture and technology. Columbus and other explorers reunited two worlds that had been separate for thousands of years. Many plants Europeans found in the western hemisphere were unfamiliar to them. The unfamiliarity extended to plants used for food. Especially since not all areas of the New World were suitable for European food crops, Europeans adopted items of the Native American diet such as maize, manioc, pumpkins, beans and potatoes. Some American crops, among them tobacco, cocoa, paprika, and sassafras, made their way to Europe, changing European diets and habits.

Europeans effected a biological revolution in America. They brought oranges, wheat, sugarcane, and stone fruits. Other attempts at transplants failed, among them grapes and olives. Wheat also failed in some places. However, other European staples prospered: cauliflower, cabbage, radish, and lettuce. Familiar "American" plants such as Kentucky bluegrass, dandelions, and daisies are all European in origin.

Europeans were amazed at the smallness of North American mammals—at least those found on the eastern coast. Yet they found the reptiles larger than those with which they were familiar. The Europeans were especially impressed by the iguana, and no European snake could match the size of the anaconda. Further inland, the bison astonished Coronado and terrified Spanish horses. For their part, Europeans introduced horses and cattle to the hemisphere. Native Americans had only a few animal servants, no animal that they rode, and no beasts of burden. Most meat and leather came from wild game. Europeans brought dogs, pigs, cattle, chickens, sheep, and goats. With no natural predators and plenty of grazing land, these animals grew both more rapidly and to be brawnier. They also brought extinction to certain native plants and animals. Some Spanish horses escaped, and within fifty-years great herds of wild horses roamed over the American continents. Some Spanish cattle also escaped and prospered in the wild. European dogs were larger and fiercer than those in the Americas; some returned to nature and reproduced. Finally, European ships brought rats, which devastated food supplies.

Indians were slow to adopt European foods; they had no need. Domesticated animals, however, were a different story. Indians had domesticated only a few animals: the dog, llamas, alpaca, guinea pig, and several kinds of fowl. They enthusiastically adopted the pig, horse, cow, chicken, dog, and goat as sources of food, clothing, and energy.

For all the differences Europeans found, they noticed similarities as well. For example, American palms were similar to those in Africa, and the jaguar resembled the leopard.

Europeans had no tradition of cultural diversity or toleration. Their culture was committed to heterosexual monogamy, which they took for granted as divinely ordained. Various Indian cultures, however, practiced promiscuity, polygamy, incest, and sodomy. Europeans assumed that these cultures were in league with the devil.

The experience of the New World challenged European beliefs. If Genesis was correct and a single creation and a single flood created the Old World, how did one explain the new? How did one reconcile the diversity of life forms with a single creation?

The biological exchange included disease. Native Americans were the most isolated of all peoples, with the exception of the Australian aborigines. The devastation of Indian
populations was due not so much to Spanish cruelty, though brutal the Spanish were, as it was to disease. The leading killer was smallpox, a highly contagious, airborne disease, followed by typhus, influenza, and measles. Syphilis, on the other hand, appears to have been a "gift" from Native Americans to Europeans. The disease first appeared in Europe in 1493, with the return of Columbus's first ship. It followed the classic course of a new disease: rapid spread, extreme virulence, followed by a lessening of deadliness. Syphilis spread throughout Europe and around the Cape of Good Hope to Asia, as sailors carried it to every port at which they stopped.

Columbus's voyage to the New World began a biological and cultural exchange, the impact of which continues to this day.

Early colonists endured hard times indeed. As the text notes, Captain John Smith had an extraordinary career as a soldier of fortune, adventurer, and explorer. Within a short time after the colonists arrived in Virginia, he became their acknowledged leader. Later, in 1624, he wrote a history of Virginia. The first document is from a section called "The Starving Time," which relates the period just after Smith returned to England in 1609. Thus, Smith's account is secondhand. The second document is a letter written in 1623 by Richard Frethorne, an indentured servant in Virginia, to his parents in England. He wrote the letter a year before Smith's *General Historie*, but the events described take place almost fifteen years after Smith's account. By this time, Jamestown was well established, but Frethorne lived in Martin's Hundred, about ten miles from Jamestown. Moreover, Frethorne was an indentured servant. Whatever their contract promised, most indentured servants could expect poor food, scant clothing, and overwork. Many did not live out their period of service.


**Questions for Discussion**

1. Many Virginians came to the colony after reading extravagant claims about the opportunities and virtues of life in Virginia. How might this have affected their adjustment to life in the colonies?

2. What does the fact that Frethorne was literate, if barely, reveal about immigrants to the New World?

3. What were the primary concerns of life in the New World?

4. In what ways was life in Virginia different from life in Massachusetts Bay?
It might well be thought, a Countrie so faire (as Virginia is) and a people so tractable, would long ere this have beene quietly possessed to the satisfaction of the adventurers, & the eternizing of the memory of those that effected it. But because all the world doe see a defailment; this following Treatise shall give satisfaction to all indifferent Readers, how the businesse hath bin carried; where no doubt they will easily understand and answer to their question, how it came to passe there was no better speed and successe in those proceedings....

The day before Captain Smith returned for England with the ships, Captain Davis arrived in a small Pinace, with some sixteene proper men more...for the Salvages no sooner understood Smith was gone, but they all revolted, and did spoile and murther all they encountered. Now wee were all constrained to live onely on that Smith had onely for his owne Companie, for the rest had consumed their proportions...Sicklemore upon the confidence of Powhatan, with about thirtie others as carelesse as himselfe, were all slaine, onely Jeffrey Shortridge escaped, and Pokahontas the Kings daughter saved a boy called Henry Spilman, that lived many yeeres after, by her meanes, amongst the Patawomekes....Now we all found the losse of Captain Smith, yea his greatest maligners could now curse his losse: as for corne, provision and contribution from the Salvages, we had nothing but mortall wounds, with clubs and arrowes; as for our Hogs, Hens, Goats, Sheepe, Horse, or what lived, our commanders, officers & Salvages daily consumed them, some small proportions sometimes we tasted, till all was devoured; then swords, armes, pieces, or any thing, wee traded with the Salvages, whose cruell fingers were so oft imbrewed in our blouds, that what by their crueltie, our Governours indiscretion, and the losse of our ships, of five hundred within six moneths after Captain Smiths departure, there remained not past sixtie men, women and children, most miserable and poore creatures; and those were preserved for the most part, by roots, herbes, acornes, walnuts, berries, now and then a little fish: they that had startch in these extremities, made no small use of it; yea, even the very skinnes of our horses. Nay, so great was our famine, that a Salvage we slew, and buried, the poorer sort tooke him up againe and eat him, and so did divers one another boyled and stewed with roots and herbs: And one amongst the rest did kill his wife, powdered [salted] her, and had eaten part of her before it was knowne, for which hee was executed, as hee well deserved; now whether shee was better roasted, boyled or carbonado'd [grilled], I know not, but of such a dish as powdered wife I never heard of. This was that time, which still to this day we called the starving time; it were too vile to say, and scarce to be beleived, what we endured:
Loveing and kind father and mother my most humble duty remembered to you hopeing in God of your good health, as I my selfe am at the makeing hereof, this is to let you understand that I your Child am in a most heavie Case by reason of the nature of the Country is such that it Causeth much sicknes [including scurvy and "the bloody flux"]...and when wee are sicke there is nothing to comfort us; for since I came out of the ship, I never at anie thing but pease, and loblollie (that is water gruell)[.] as for deare or venison I never saw anie since I came into this land there is indeed some foule, but Wee are not allowed to goe, and get yt, but must Worke hard both earelie, and late for a messe of water gruell, and a mouthfull of bread, and beife[.] a mouthfull of bread for a pennie loafe must serve for 4 men which is most pitifull if you did knowe as much as I, when people crie out day, and night, Oh that they were in England without their lymbes and would not care to loose anie lymbe to bee in England againe, yea though they beg from doore to doore....I have nothing at all, no not a shirt to my backe, but two Raggges nor no Clothes, but one poore suite, nor but one paire of shooes, but one paire of stockins, but one Capp, but two bands, my Cloke is stolen by one of my owne fellowes, and to his dying hower would not tell mee what he did with it [although some friends saw the "fellowe" buy butter and beef from a ship, probably purchased with Frethorne's cloak]....but I am not halfe a quarter so strong as I was in England, and all is for want of victualls, for I doe protest unto you, that I have eaten more in a day at home than I have allowed me here for a Weeke....

O that you did see may daylie and hourelie sighes, grones, and teares, and thumpes that I afford mine owne brest, and rue and Curse the time of my birth with holy Job. I thought no head had beene able to hold so much water as hath and doth dailie flow from mine eyes.
CHAPTER 2

*American Society in the Making*

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

**What Is an American?** Americans came from a variety of backgrounds, and, although they never completely abandoned their various heritages, they became different from their relatives who remained in the Old World. Even the most rebellious settlers seldom intended to create an entirely new civilization, but physical separation and a new environment led to different patterns of development. At the same time, no single "American" type emerged; settlers came from a variety of backgrounds. Americans remained as different from each other as all were from their European cousins.

**Spanish Settlements.** The influence of Franciscan friars shaped life in Spanish North America. The Franciscans established strings of mission settlements along the upper reaches of the Rio Grande, in northern Florida, and along the coastal regions of present-day Georgia and South Carolina. The friars instructed thousands of Indians in the rudiments of Catholic faith and taught them European agricultural techniques. The Franciscans also exacted a heavy price in labor from the Indians who built and maintained the missions, tilled the fields, and served the friars. This kind of treatment led to rebellions in many of the missions. Although most were isolated and easily repressed, the Pueblo Indians combined under a religious leader named Pope in 1680, razed the town of Santa Fe, and pushed the Spaniards back to El Paso. By the 1690s, the Spanish regained control of the territory lost to the rebellion.

**The Chesapeake Colonies.** The southern colonies of English North America consisted of three regions: the Chesapeake Bay, the "low country" of the Carolinas, and the "back country" extending into the Appalachians. Not until the eighteenth century would common features prompt people to think of this as a single region. Although Virginia grew in the decade after it became a royal colony, the death rate remained high. Newcomers underwent a period of "seasoning," or illness. Those who survived developed immunities to the diseases of the region. However, life expectancy remained short, resulting in a society where living grandparents were a rarity. More often than not, before children reached maturity, they had lost at least one parent. The loss of both parents was not uncommon. A shortage of women meant that significant numbers of men did not have an opportunity to form traditional European families.

**The Lure of Land.** Agriculture remained the mainstay of life in the Chesapeake and in the South. Since the London Company realized little profit, it used land, its only asset, to pay off debts and to raise capital. The use of land to attract settlers gave rise to the head right system. The availability of land attracted landless Europeans, many of whom could not
afford passage. Thus a system of indentured servitude evolved to bring those with land and money together with those who wished to go to America. Indentured servants worked for a period of years in exchange for their passage. Those who survived the seasoning period and an often harsh period of servitude became free. Many became landowners, but the best lands already belonged to large planters. The ever-increasing need for labor and the expense of meeting that demand with indentured servants led the colonists to look for another solution.

"Solving" the Labor Shortage: Slavery. The first African blacks to arrive in America landed in Jamestown in 1619. Whether they were treated as slaves or indentured servants is impossible to determine. By about 1640, however, some, although certainly not all, blacks were slaves. Racial prejudice and the institution of slavery interacted to bring about the complete degradation of Africans in the English colonies. Although it spread throughout the colonies, slavery grew slowly at first. Most colonists preferred white servants. With improving economic conditions in England, however, the flow of new servants slackened in the 1670s. At the same time, slaves became more readily available. For a variety of reasons, indentured servitude gave way to slavery as a solution to the colonies' need for labor.

Prosperity in a Pipe: Tobacco. Farming made subsistence possible, but, in order to enjoy anything beyond a basic existence, the colonists needed to find a cash crop. Several experiments failed, but they found a successful cash crop in tobacco. Unlike wheat, tobacco required no expensive plows to clear the land; it could be cultivated with a hoe. The crop required extensive human labor, but it produced a high yield and returned a high profit. The Tidewater region had many navigable rivers, and the planters spread along their banks. The Chesapeake did not develop towns and roads because commerce traveled along the rivers. Tobacco rapidly exhausted the soil, which worked to the advantage of larger agricultural units that could leave some fields to lie fallow.

Bacon's Rebellion. Their distance from centers of authority made settlers in the Chesapeake difficult to subject to authority. The most serious challenge to established power was Bacon's Rebellion. A split developed between the ruling faction in Jamestown under Sir William Berkeley and settlers at the western edge of settlement. When Berkeley refused to authorize an expedition against Indians who had been attacking outlying settlements, western planters took matters into their own hands. Under Nathaniel Bacon, the westerners demonstrated a willingness to attack not only Indians but the governor as well. Bacon and his followers marched on Jamestown and forced Berkeley to grant them authority for further attacks on Indians. Later they burned Jamestown. Not long after, Bacon became ill with a "violent flux" and died. An English squadron then arrived and restored order. On the surface, the uprising changed nothing. Bacon's followers and their opponents had no differences that could not be compromised; both wanted cheap labor. In the quarter century following Bacon's Rebellion, the Chesapeake region became committed to black slavery, and slave ownership resulted in large differences in wealth.
The Carolinas. Like their fellow colonists to the north, English and Scotch-Irish settlers in the Carolinas relied on agriculture. Tobacco flourished in North Carolina. The introduction of Madagascar rice at the end of the seventeenth century provided South Carolina with a cash crop. In the 1740s, another successful cash crop, indigo, was introduced into South Carolina. The production of cash crops meant that the southern colonies could obtain manufactured goods and various luxuries from Europe. Despite the obvious benefits of the situation, it prevented the development of a diversified economy in the southern colonies.

Slavery emerged early on as the dominant form of labor on South Carolina's plantations. Blacks constituted a majority of the population in South Carolina. Each colony promulgated regulations governing the behavior of blacks, which increased in severity with the density of the black population. Slaves came from different places and performed different tasks; there was no single "slave experience." The more skilled a slave, for example, the more difficult it became to prevent that slave from running away. Few runaways, however, became rebels. Still, even if masters exaggerated the danger of slave revolts, they had good reason to fear their slaves.

A few isolated reformers, mostly Quakers, opposed slavery. However, even some Quakers owned slaves, and racial prejudice was common even among Quakers.

Home and Family in the South. Except for the most affluent planters, life in the southern colonies was primitive and uncomfortable. Houses were small; furniture and utensils were sparse and crudely made. Clothing for most was rough and, because soap was expensive, usually unwashed. Women only rarely worked in the fields, but their duties included tending animals, making butter and cheese, pickling and preserving, spinning, and sewing. Women also cared for their own and often orphan children as well. Education in the South was less widespread than in New England. Some middling planters enjoyed a more comfortable lifestyle, but until the early eighteenth century, only a handful of planters achieved real affluence. These large planters controlled politics. The spread-out population made it difficult to support churches. In spite of its standing as the official religion with the support of public funds, the Anglican church never became a powerful force in the South. In this society, social events such as births, marriages, and funerals were great occasions.

Georgia and the Back Country. This region included the Great Valley of Virginia, the Piedmont, and what became Georgia. Georgia was founded by a group of philanthropists in London, who conceived the idea of taking honest persons imprisoned for debt and resettling them in the New World. The idealistic regulations governing the colony swiftly fell into disuse. So too did various economic projects. Georgia developed an economy similar to South Carolina's. Settlers also began to settle farther inland. In North Carolina, a dispute over representation in the assembly led to a pitched battle between frontiersmen and troops dispatched by the assembly. The Regulators, as the frontiersmen called themselves, were crushed and their leaders executed.
Puritan New England. New England enjoyed several advantages over the southern colonies. Boston, for example, had a dependable supply of water. The terrain and climate made for a much healthier habitat.

The Puritan Family. The Puritans brought more supplies with them than other colonists, which helped ease their adjustment. In addition to supplies, Puritans brought a plan for an ordered society. Central to that plan was a covenant, an agreement to bind individuals to the group. Puritan families were nuclear and patriarchal.

Puritan Women and Children. Mortality among infants and children was lower in New England than in the Chesapeake (or Europe, for that matter), but few families escaped the loss of a child. The outbreak of the English Civil War ended the Great Migration. Thereafter, the high birthrate and low mortality rate accounted primarily for the growth of the colony. As a result, the population of New England was more evenly distributed by age and sex than in colonies to the south. Women's childbearing years extended over two decades. Social standards required that husbands rule over wives and that parents rule over children. Children were expected to take on duties of adults at an early age, and liberal use of corporal punishment ensured strict discipline. Older children might be sent to live with another family or apprenticed to a craftsman.

Visible Saints and Others. Puritans believed that church membership should be a joint decision between the would-be member and the church. Obvious sinners were rejected out of hand. With the Great Migration, large numbers of applicants enabled the churches to restrict membership to "visible saints." A decade later, new conditions led to a reconsideration. Fewer than half of all adults in New England were church members by the 1650s, and many young people refused to submit to the zealous scrutiny necessary for membership. Growing numbers of nonmembers led to problems. How could they be compelled to attend churches? How could they be taxed but not allowed to vote? Could they be baptized? If baptism were restricted to church members and a majority of the community did not qualify, the majority of people would be living in a state of original sin. The solution was the Half-Way Covenant, which provided for limited membership for any applicant not known to be a sinner who would accept the church covenant.

Democracies Without Democrats. At least with respect to local issues, the colonies were largely left to govern themselves. Puritan theory regarded government as both a civil covenant and the principal means for policing the institutions on which the maintenance of social order depended. However, Puritan civil authorities and ministers of the Puritan (Congregational) Church came under attack from Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Quakers. In spite of seemingly repressive laws passed by the governments of Massachusetts and Connecticut, many such laws remained in force without rousing much local opposition. Further, primary responsibility for maintaining order rested with the towns of the region.
**The Dominion of New England.** During the Restoration, the English government sought to bring the colonies under effective royal control. Massachusetts's charter was annulled, and it became a royal colony. Edmund Andros, a professional soldier, became governor. After the Glorious Revolution, colonists overthrew Andros.

**Salem Bewitched.** Salem Village, a rural settlement near Salem, petitioned the General Court for a church of their own. After a few years, the General Court granted their request. A series of preachers failed to unite the feuding factions of the village. Samuel Parris became minister in 1689 and proved equally unable to unite the village; the church voted to dismiss him. Parris's daughters and Ann Putnam began to behave in ways their elders diagnosed as bewitched. They accused three socially marginal women of witchcraft. The three were brought before a court, but the accusations spread and worked up the social ladder. Finally, a group of ministers intervened, and Governor Phips adjourned the court, but not before nineteen persons had been hanged and one more pressed to death by heavy stones. The episode also revealed some anxieties Puritan men felt toward women. Many Puritans believed that Satan used the allure of female sexuality to work his will. In addition, many accused witches were widows of high status or older women who owned property; such women potentially subverted the patriarchal authorities of church and state.

**Higher Education in New England.** Demand for educated ministers outstripped supply in the 1630s. The Massachusetts General Court appropriated money for "a schoole or colledge," and John Harvard left double the appropriation and his library to what became Harvard. Massachusetts and Connecticut passed laws requiring towns of any size to establish grammar schools. As a result, New England had a remarkably high rate of literacy. Several ministers in Connecticut became disenchanted with the growing religious toleration at Harvard and founded a new college named after its first benefactor, Elihu Yale.

**Prosperity Undermines Puritanism.** Colonists in New England turned early to farming. They also grazed cattle, sheep, and hogs. Game and firewood abounded in the forests, as did fish in the Atlantic. Yet a short growing season and rocky, hilly terrain meant that farmers produced little surplus. Moreover, all of the products New Englanders grew were available in Europe. Thus, while fed and sheltered, New Englanders had little surplus and nowhere to sell it. More pious settlers welcomed the situation as protection against becoming too worldly. Massachusetts had laws against usury and profiteering.

**A Merchant's World.** Early efforts to produce manufactured goods in New England failed. Fur seemed a likely item to trade for English manufactured goods, but fur-bearing animals retreated away from settlements. Finally, fish provided merchants with a marketable commodity. This was the start of the "triangular trade," which was usually polygonal rather than triangular. Trade became the driving force of the New England economy. Portsmouth, Salem, Boston, Newport, and New Haven grew rapidly. Boston became the third most populous city in the British Empire — a thriving metropolis with street crime, prostitution, and unemployment.
**The Middle Colonies: Economic Basis.** The Middle Colonies, located between New England and the Chesapeake, contained elements of the distinctive features of the colonies to the north and south. For example, farmers to the north produced crops primarily for local consumption; farmers to the south produced primarily for export. Middle Colony farmers did both.


*"The Best Poor Man's Country."* Land was easy to obtain in Pennsylvania. The situation in New York was somewhat less favorable, but ordinary New Yorkers could become landowners fairly readily. Although founded fifty years after New York and Boston, Philadelphia grew more rapidly than either, thanks to navigable rivers that penetrated deep into the back country. By the middle of the eighteenth century, Philadelphia became the largest city in English America. Not only did merchants do well, but artisans often left substantial estates.

**The Politics of Diversity.** The Middle Colonies developed a more sophisticated political culture than either New England or the southern colonies. All of the Middle Colonies had popularly elected representative assemblies, for which most males could vote. New Yorkers and Pennsylvanians were less likely than southern colonists to defer to the landed gentry. Leisler's Rebellion shaped New York politics for two decades. Political divisions led to the trial for seditious libel of John Peter Zenger, the editor of an opposition newspaper. The Zenger trial established truth as a defense against libel, which was contrary to English common law. Pennsylvania was split between the proprietary party and a Quaker party. Settlers in western Pennsylvania, resentful of eastern indifference to the threat of Indian raids, took matters into their own hands. The Paxton boys slaughtered an Indian village and marched on the capital. Ben Franklin talked them out of attacking the town.

**Rebellious Women.** Many political disputes of the era demonstrated a general anxiety over the role of women. Anne Hutchinson, for example, incurred the wrath of Puritan leaders by criticizing their teachings and challenging them in public debate. This concern was not confined to New England. Although the authority of husbands differed over time and place, the general trend was away from a rigidly hierarchical family. Nevertheless, women found themselves increasingly relegated to the margins of public life during the eighteenth century. By the middle of the century, the general expectation was that white women would confine themselves to matters relating to the home.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. What made life in the Chesapeake so precarious.

2. How the realities of the New World forced the London Company to accept changes in their plans for colonization.

3. The factors that led to the adoption of slavery in the American colonies.

4. What led to the cultivation of tobacco and the consequences of that decision.

5. The issues that led to Bacon's Rebellion.


7. The rise of the "triangle trade" and why it was not really triangular.

8. The factors that led to the growth of the Middle Colonies.

9. The ethnic diversity of the Middle Colonies.

10. Changing attitudes toward the role of women.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. The interaction of European institutions with the wilderness led to the creation of new and unique institutions and attitudes. Discuss how the New World changed European institutions, customs, and beliefs to create American institutions, customs, and beliefs.

2. How did changes in England affect the development of the American colonies?

3. Do efforts to represent the past in terms that make sense to people today, such as the movie, *The Crucible*, aid or obstruct in understanding the past? One way of approaching this question would be to compare Arthur Miller's play, first performed on Broadway in 1953, with the movie, which came out in 1996. How did the emphases and portrayals of characters change?

4. Drawing on the “Debating the Past” section and on relevant material elsewhere in this chapter, what forces led to discord in Puritan towns?
LECTURE SUPPLEMENTS

The Salem Witch Trials

The Salem witch trials are one of the most dramatic and best-known episodes in colonial American history. The text relates the story without speculating on the possible causes and only hints at the social origins of the outbreak of accusations of witchcraft. The "Re-Viewing the Past" section offers an analysis based on the sexual frustration of the young girls who made the accusations of witchcraft. The story of the crisis in Salem Village has fascinated historians (as well as playwrights and film producers), and recent years have seen the publication of several sophisticated attempts to understand this puzzling episode.

The events began in obscurity with several teenage girls and their experiments in fortune-telling. Abigail and Betty Parris and Ann Putnam were worried about their futures and began to cast spells and practice "conjuration with sieves and keys, peas, and nails, and horseshoes." Their real concern was their prospects for marriage. One girl developed a primitive crystal ball made of the white of an egg suspended in a glass; she saw a chilling vision: "a specter in the likeness of a coffin."

Eventually the magic they tried to practice took control of them. We probably will never know what the girls actually experienced; perhaps they were not sure themselves. In any case, in February 1692, adults in the community began to describe "odd postures," "foolish ridiculous speeches," "distempers," and "fits." At first, the village tried informal means to control the incident. Rev. Parris called in a local physician, who detected the presence of the "Evil Hand," or malefic witchcraft. If this were the case, the problem was not medical but legal. Parris took the problem to several other ministers. More than a month passed without legal action, but the afflictions began to spread. Seven or eight other girls, including three from the household of Thomas Putnam, were affected.

At last the troubled village turned to law. Under intense questioning by adults, the girls named three tormentors: Sarah Good, Sarah Osborne, and Tituba. The next day the two nearest members of the provincial legislature made the trip from Salem town to Salem Village and examined the women. All three women were jailed.

If this had followed the normal pattern of witchcraft episodes in New England, things would have ended there; but the pattern did not hold. Even with the women in prison, the bizarre behavior of the girls continued. More people were arrested and examined, and still the outbreak did not abate. The arrests accelerated, and the accusations moved up the social scale. Among those accused was George Burroughs, a former minister who had moved to a frontier parish in Maine.

The outbreak came at a particular time in the history of the colony. Massachusetts was without a legally constituted government. After the overthrow of Edmund Andros (see "The Dominion of New England" section), the colony lobbied for restoration of their original charter. In early 1692, the colonists learned that a new governor, Sir William Phips, would arrive with a new charter. Thus, the most severe challenge to the colony's legal system came at a time when the system was immobilized.

Phips arrived and established a court to hear the backlog of witchcraft cases. Several were found guilty and hanged, including Burroughs, who protested his innocence and created
a stir by correctly reciting the Lord's Prayer (it was assumed that those in league with the devil could not do so).

The last executions took place on September 22, but the outbreak continued. Roughly one hundred suspected witches remained in jail, and arrests continued.

Finally the intervention of a group of influential ministers, led by Increase Mather, put an end to the episode. Mather preached a sermon, published on October 3, titled "Cases of Conscience." In it, he asserted that "it were better that ten suspected witches should escape, than that one innocent person should be condemned." He demanded solid proof. Spectral evidence was not enough to convict a person of a capital offense. The devil might cause someone bewitched to imagine that innocent people afflicted them. The devil might also take the form of an innocent. Because of these difficulties, argued Mather, "the Evidence in this Crime ought to be as clear as in any other Crimes of a Capital nature." Thus, two eyewitnesses should be required. Mather cited the "Rule of Charity" to argue for a presumption of innocence. Only confession, the testimony of an actual witness, and empirical tests should be used to convict witches.

Why then did this outbreak happen? And why did it go on? Imagine how easily the girls themselves could have been accused of witchcraft. After all, they had been conjuring. In short, the decisive factor was the reaction of adults and the interpretation they chose to place on events.

With a slight change of social ingredients, Salem might have been the location for a full-scale revival, rather than the scene for the murder of innocents. The descriptions of the girls' "fits" and their incoherent speeches were similar to visions and the Pentecostal gift of tongues. Both the religious revivals of the eighteenth century and the witchcraft episode witnessed a reversal of status; young people broke out of their normally subservient roles and became the leaders of their community. The key ingredient in each case is the interpretation placed on events.

In order to understand why Northampton of the 1730s became the scene for a revival and Salem the scene of tragedy, one needs to understand the social dynamics of Salem Village.

Salem began as a commercial settlement. Its natural harbor and rivers connecting the town to the interior made it a focal point of imperial trade. As the town grew, it made grants of land in the interior. Among those who took up residence in the interior were names that appear in the witchcraft episode such as Putnam, Procter, and Ingersoll. Part of the new area was called Salem Farms.

Salem became increasingly mercantile, and the interior provided food, resources, and tax revenue. Several areas became separate towns (Waltham, Manchester, Marblehead, and Beverly), but not Salem Farms (Salem Village). Nevertheless, the interests of Salem Village and Salem town diverged. The villagers asked to be relieved of night watch duty in 1667, pleading that it was too far to travel. The villagers got some degree of autonomy when they won the right to build their own meetinghouse and hire their own minister in 1672. However, the town still did not have a "church." A Puritan church was a select fellowship of "visible saints" banded together under a covenant. Not until 1689 did the residents of Salem Village get a church of their own.

This peculiar situation, a town without its own government or (for most of its
history) church, was potentially disruptive. Salem Village had a reputation as a contentious community. The level of bickering was probably no greater than that of many villages in New England, but Salem Village lacked the normal structures for settling these disputes. In this environment, grievances easily escalated. The witchcraft incident did not generate divisions in the village; rather, it revealed the intensity of divisions that already existed.

Salem town became increasingly urban and wealthy. Salem Village, however, did not prosper. Moreover, it could not expand, since it was surrounded by other villages. As land holdings were split up between children, each generation owned less land. This accounts for Salem Village's border disputes with other towns and its reputation for contentiousness.

Some villagers, usually those in the eastern part, threw in their lot with the town. The key was proximity to the town and to the Ipswich Road. The village's best farmland was close to town, and this area also had access to roads and waterways connecting to the town. Some of these people engaged in commercial farming; they provided food for the growing town. Others owned taverns or provided crafts to the town.

Those further west pursued an older way of life, subsistence farming, and were usually isolated from the town and its economic activity. From this group came the faction concerned with establishing an independent church. In the witchcraft episode, the faction revolving around the town interests became the accused. Perhaps from the perspective of the more rural element, they were guilty of pursuing individual interests, which was, after all, the original sin. The emergence of the new commercial economy posed a threat to the Puritan community. Thus, to the villagers, the town appeared hostile, not just because it followed a different line of economic development, but because that economic development led to a different sort of society.

Unable to relieve their frustrations and conflicts through normal political means, some Salem Villagers fell back on an archaic strategy. They regarded those who threatened them not as political enemies but as morally defective individuals. In one sense, the witchcraft trials were an attempt of a displaced elite to reassert their position.

Those most likely to be accused of witchcraft lived in the eastern part of the village and near the Ipswich Road. They were wealthier than their accusers, who lived in the north and west parts of the village. Most of the accused were outsiders. Most lived outside the actual boundaries of Salem Village; many lived in the town. The first group of accused tended to be outcasts. Tituba was a slave; Sarah Good was a pauper; Sarah Osborne was a bedridden old woman who had married an Irish immigrant she hired, giving rise to gossip. Many of the accused were socially mobile. Those on the way up represented the social threat. Those on the way down were a constant and uncomfortable reminder that economic security and status were precarious.

Thus, the witchcraft episode in Salem was not just a peculiar event in a random place. It represented an episode in the social development of New England.

For further information, see Paul Boyer and Stephen Nissenbaum, *Salem Possessed: The Social Origins of Witchcraft* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974); Marc Mappen, ed., *Witches and Historians: Interpretations of Salem* (Malabar,

**Anne Hutchinson's Challenge to Puritan Theology**

Puritans in England and America pondered, even agonized, over the path to salvation. John Calvin had taught that an infinitely powerful God, at the beginning of time, had selected certain individuals for salvation. God would let these individuals know of their selection (they would, in the language of the Puritans, be "called"). The calling resulted in a Covenant of Grace. God would remit all sins and instill a profound faith (Puritans named this "justification") that would enable the Saints to resist the temptation to sin (a state the Puritans described as "sanctification"). The Saint would therefore live a virtuous life, one that would merit salvation, but it would not earn salvation. The idea that an individual could earn salvation through works would place limits on the absolute power of God.

Calvin's theology presented problems for a social organization based on his beliefs. Since God determined everything, how could individuals be given credit for doing good works or be blamed for doing evil? Moreover, since the elect constituted only a small minority, the majority had no possible reason for behaving well, since they were doomed to hell, anyway.

Puritans in England and America confronted this problem by teaching that, although few were destined to be saved, all humans had a duty to prepare themselves for God's grace. Puritans reasoned that while God might not reward all who led virtuous lives, he would surely punish sinners. Some even argued that God offered his grace to all who would receive it; all he asked was that one open one's heart to Christ.

The contradiction with the teachings of Calvin was apparent. Such a belief limited the power of God; it gave people a choice, and therefore a role, in determining whether or not they would be saved. The contradiction troubled at least one English minister, John Cotton, who believed that the gift of God's faith was free and absolute. From that gift flowed faith and rectitude. Thus, those who were saved would do good works, but those actions derived from the spirit of God in the individual, not from adherence to the laws or authority of humans. To some, however, Cotton's idea of the spirit of God dwelling in an individual seemed to elevate that individual to semi-divine status and perhaps even removed that individual from the duty to adhere to temporal law. Such ideas were called antinomianism and had long been deemed a heresy. Cotton stopped short of antinomianism by teaching that
Christ did not actually dwell in the souls of the saved but rather served as a model.

Among Cotton's followers in England were William Hutchinson, a successful cloth merchant, and his wife Anne. The daughter of a minister with a better education than was average for a woman of that time, Anne was deeply religious. Sometime after her marriage, she experienced a calling. She studied the Bible and found inspiration in Cotton's sermons.

In 1633, authorities of the Church of England called John Cotton to account for his teachings. Cotton fled to the new town of Boston in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Soon after, the Hutchinsons followed him. William quickly reestablished himself in the cloth trade and became a leading citizen. In addition to having a large family, Anne was a nurse.

Not long after the Hutchinsons arrived in Boston, the minister of the Boston Church, John Wilson, returned to England to settle some family matters. Cotton, who had been serving as an assistant, took over for Wilson. His preaching revitalized the congregation; membership doubled in a year. However, Cotton's emphasis on the Covenant of Grace frightened some leaders of the congregation, who worried that his doctrines might be construed to invalidate civil authority and rules of behavior.

Anne began holding informal meetings at her house the day after church services for women who could not make it to church. She repeated the substance of Cotton's sermons and expounded on them. Women who attended asked questions and requested further explication, something women could not do in more public settings. As the popularity of Anne's meetings grew, husbands and then other men began to attend. Many participants came from Boston's merchant elite. Her emphasis on the Covenant of Grace made assurance of salvation a private, spiritual, and internal matter that had little, if anything, to do with daily behavior. For merchants, whose success might depend on sharp trading and who might feel too busy to engage in good works, Anne's approach had an obvious appeal. In addition, the rejection of civil authority inherent in antinomianism could well attract merchants who resented the power of the rural-dominated General Court. It could also attract the unlettered who resented what they perceived to be the arrogance of the university-educated ministry. Women might use such doctrines to challenge the authority their husbands exercised over them at home and their ministers exercised over them in church.

On Wilson's return, Anne began to criticize his sermons, which she maintained preached the Covenant of Works (the belief that individuals might win salvation through good deeds). On one occasion, Anne walked out of the church when Wilson rose to preach. Many women in the congregation followed her. In December 1636, a group of ministers met with Anne to examine her views. Anne managed a standoff.

In January, John Wheelwright preached a sermon that amounted to a charge that a majority of the clergy in Boston had been infected by the Covenant of Works. Wheelwright was a radical puritan minister who had married William's sister and followed the Hutchinsons to America. Although Boston was not a theocracy, church and state were mutually dependent. Heretical religious ideas constituted a civil offense because they disrupted the community. The General Court found Wheelwright guilty of sedition and contempt.

When the General Court met in November 1637, it banished Wheelwright and disfranchised another of Anne's supporters, John Coggeshall. Anne was called before the Court on November 7. John Winthrop, governor of the colony, led the interrogation. In
response to questions, Anne denied that she had alleged that the other ministers preached a covenant of works; she had simply said that they did not teach the Covenant of Grace as clearly as Cotton. She protested that she did not deny the value of good works; she simply held that they could not win salvation. As Lyle Koehler has written, "Anne managed to parry the verbal thrusts of the ministers and magistrates by replying to their many questions with questions of her own, forcing them to justify their positions from the Bible, pointing out their logical inconsistencies, and using innuendo to cast aspersions upon their authoritarianism."

Indeed, Anne was defending herself quite ably until she made the kind of statement for which the authorities had been looking. "I know that for this you goe about to doe to me," she said, "God will ruine you and your posterity, and this whole State." When the authorities asked how she knew this, she replied, "By an immediate revelation." Cotton tried to explain what she meant, but this was close enough to heresy for the authorities to act. The General court voted to convict her, and Winthrop sentenced her to be banished from the Colony. Anne was also excommunicated from the Boston church, and she and Cotton had a falling out during the proceedings.

The Hutchinsons moved to what later became Rhode Island. As Anne's religious views evolved, they took a direction similar to those of George Fox, a young man in England who would found the Society of Friends. Anne was killed in an Indian attack before the first Quakers made their way to North America, but the Society of Friends would draw from among her followers some of its first members in North America.

**Introduction**

The interaction of English people and culture with the wilderness produced a new culture and a new people, which we identify as American. The transformation was not always easy. William Byrd II of Westover was a prime example. Byrd was a member of the American gentry, but, according to Kenneth Lockridge, he wanted nothing more than to be an English gentleman. [See Kenneth Lockridge, *The Diary and Life of William Byrd II of Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1987).] Byrd spent his life in a desperate attempt to live up to his own conception of an English gentleman. He ordered his life in a compulsive way along those lines. Lockridge argues that Byrd's behavior reflected the image of a perfect English gentleman developed through his schooling in England and his reading on the topic. According to Lockridge, the diary entries for July 7, 8, and 9, 1709, reveal this pattern. For all his efforts, however, Byrd never really lived the life of English gentility. For one thing, his perception of the life of an English gentleman was a bit off the mark. He found, according to Lockridge, "no living model with which to fill in the details of what a gentleman was." Byrd's first-hand contact with the English gentry was that of an outside observer. He therefore relied on his reading of instruction manuals; he had literally to "do it by the book." Naturally, this produced a somewhat skewed image of what it meant to be a gentleman. Moreover, the realities of life in the colonies and the English social structure also conspired against him. In fact, unknown to himself, he represented something entirely new—the creation of an American gentleman. For additional information, see Michal J. Rozbicki, *The Complete Colonial Gentleman: Cultural Legitimacy in Plantation America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1998).

Michel-Guillaume Jean de Crévecoeur's account of the American character is less conflicted. Born in Caen, Normandy, in 1735, he migrated to French Canada in 1755. He served with the French against the British in the French and Indian War. While serving under Montcalm in the defense of Quebec, Crévecoeur was wounded and hospitalized. He made his way to New York, where he worked as an Indian trader and surveyor. Eventually, he married and began life as a farmer in Orange County, New York, where he lived as "an American farmer" from 1769 to 1780. His American is a mixture of European cultures, changed by contact with the wilderness. For more information on Crévecoeur, see Gay Wilson Allen and Roger Asselineau, *St. John de Crévecoeur: The Life of an American Farmer* (New York: Viking, 1987).
Questions for Discussion

1. Why was it so difficult for Byrd to accept being an American gentleman?

2. Does Byrd's embrace of things English make him less "American"?

3. How does Crèvecoeur's description of an American apply to Byrd?
7. I rose at 5 o'clock and read a chapter in Hebrew and some Greek in Josephus. I said my prayers and ate milk for breakfast. I danced my dance, and settled my accounts. I read some Latin. It was extremely hot. I ate stewed mutton for dinner. In the afternoon it began to rain and blow very violently so that it blew down my fence. It likewise thundersed. In all the time I have been in Virginia I never heard it blow harder. I read Latin again and Greek in Homer. In the evening we took a walk in the garden. I said my prayers and had good health, good humor, and good thoughts, thanks be to God Almighty.

8. I rose at 5 o'clock and read a chapter in Hebrew and some Greek in Josephus. I said my prayers and ate milk for breakfast. I danced my dance. I read some Latin. Tom returned from Williamsburg and brought me a letter from Mr. Bland which told me the wine came out very well. I ate nothing but pudding for dinner. In the afternoon I read some more Latin and Greek in Homer. Then I took a walk about the plantation. I said my prayers and had good health, good thoughts, and good humor, thanks be to God Almighty.

9. I rose at 5 o'clock and read two chapters in Hebrew and some Greek in Josephus. I said my prayers and ate milk and apples for breakfast with Captain Wilcox who called here this morning. I danced my dance. I wrote a letter to England and read some Latin. I ate roast chicken for dinner. In the afternoon I saluted my wife and took a nap. I read more Latin and Greek in Homer. Then I took a walk about the plantation. I neglected to say my prayers. I had good health, good thoughts, and good humor, thanks be to God Almighty.
He [an "enlightened Englishman" on first seeing America] is arrived on a new continent; a modern society offers itself to his contemplation, different from what he had hitherto seen. It is not composed, as in Europe, of great lords who possess every thing, and of a herd of people who have nothing. Here are no aristocratical families, no courts, no kings, no bishops, no ecclesiastical dominion, no invisible power giving to a few a very visible one; no great manufacturers employing thousands, no great refinements of luxury. The rich and poor are not so far removed from each other as they are in Europe....

The next wish of this traveller will be to know whence came all these people? They are a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans, and Swedes. From this promiscuous breed, that race now called Americans have arisen....

What then is the American, this new man? He is either an European, or the descendant of an European, hence that strange mixture of blood, which you will find in no other country. I could point out to you a family whose grandfather was an Englishman, whose wife was Dutch, whose son married a French woman, and whose present four sons have now four wives of different nations. He is an American, who leaving behind him all his ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced, the new government he obeys, and the new rank he holds....The Americans were once scattered all over Europe; here they are incorporated into one of the finest systems of population which has ever appeared, and which will hereafter become distinct by the power of the different climates they inhabit....

But to return to our back settlers. I must tell you, that there is something in the proximity of the woods, which is very singular. It is with men as it is with the plants and animals that grow and live in the forests; they are entirely different from those that live in the plains....By living in or near the woods, their actions are regulated by the wildness of the neighbourhood....
CHAPTER 3

America in the British Empire

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The British Colonial System. The British colonies in North America were founded independently by people with differing backgrounds and motivations. Each British colony had its own form of government, and the British government did not regard the colonies as a unit. Common traditions and loyalties developed slowly. However, English political and legal institutions took hold throughout the colonies. Few questioned England's sovereignty; at the same time, distance and British inefficiency allowed the colonists substantial freedom. The Crown generally left colonists to make their own laws pertaining to local matters. Although the King's Privy Council held responsibility for formulating colonial policy, it never established general principles to which all colonial legislatures had to conform. Rather, it operated on a case-by-case basis. Parliamentary legislation applied to the colonies, but before mid-century, Parliament legislated on specific conditions in North America only rarely.

Occasionally, British authorities attempted to create a more cohesive and efficient colonial system. By the late seventeenth century, British policy was to transform proprietary and corporate colonies into royal colonies. The Board of Trade took over management of colonial affairs in 1696. It became the focus of colonial lobbying efforts designed to influence British policy.

The failure to establish a centralized colonial government contributed to the development of independent governments and eventually to the United States' federal system.

Mercantilism. Mercantilism described a loosely related set of policies designed to make a country as nearly self-sufficient as possible, while selling more goods abroad than it imported. This theory supported colonization. Even if colonies lacked gold and silver, they could provide raw materials and markets for the mother country.

The Navigation Acts. Commerce was essential to mercantilism. Beginning in the 1650s, Parliament responded to Dutch preeminence in shipping. The Navigation Acts reserved the entire trade of the colonies to English ships and required that the captain and three-quarters of the crew be English. The acts also limited the export of certain enumerated items. These acts were designed to stimulate British industry and trade and to restrict and shape, but not to destroy, infant colonial industries.
The Effects of Mercantilism. Mercantilist policy benefited both England and the colonies, although England's interests prevailed when conflicts arose. Thus, had the system continued to operate, it would have hampered the colonies. On the other hand, the inefficiency of English administration lessened the impact of mercantilist regulations. When regulations became burdensome, the colonists simply ignored them; and England was inclined to look the other way. In fact, the mercantilist laws really reflected as much as they molded the colonial economy.

The Great Awakening. People in the colonies began to recognize common interests and a common character. By about 1750, the word "American" had entered the language. One early common experience was the Great Awakening, a wave of religious enthusiasm. Religious fervor had slackened in all the colonies by the early eighteenth century. Two ministers, Theodore Frelinghuysen (a Calvinist) and William Tennent (a Presbyterian), arrived in the 1720s and sought to instill the evangelical zeal they had witnessed among Pietists and Methodists in Europe. The colonial tours of George Whitefield, a powerful orator, sparked much religious enthusiasm. Whitefield did not deny the doctrine of predestination, but he preached of a God receptive to good intentions.

Many denominations split between the "Old Lights" or "Old Sides," who supported more traditional approaches, and the "New Lights" or "New Sides," who embraced revivalism. Such splits often reflected class divisions. The better educated and more affluent members of a congregation tended to support traditional arrangements.

The Rise and Fall of Jonathan Edwards. Jonathan Edwards was the most famous native-born revivalist of the Great Awakening. He took over his grandfather's church in Northampton, Massachusetts, in 1727. Edwards's grandfather, Solomon Stoddard, had been a highly influential minister who practiced a policy of "open enrollment" at his church. Members did not need to present evidence of saving grace; they needed only to behave well. Edwards set out to ignite a spiritual revival. His sermons warned in graphic language of the Hell awaiting the unconverted. Edwards's approach upset some of his parishioners, and in 1749 they voted unanimously to dismiss him. A reaction against religious enthusiasm set in by the early 1750s. Although it caused divisions, the Great Awakening also fostered religious toleration. The Awakening was also the first truly national event in American history.

The Enlightenment in America. The Enlightenment had an enormous impact on America. The founders of the colonies were contemporaries of scientists such as Galileo, Descartes, and Newton, who provided a new understanding of the natural world. The earth, heavens, humans, and animals all seemed part of a great machine, which God had set in motion. Through observation and reason, humans might come to understand the laws of nature. Faith in these ideas produced the Age of Reason.

Ideas of European thinkers reached America with startling speed, and the writings of John Locke and other political theorists found a receptive audience. Ideas that in Europe were discussed only by an intellectual elite became almost commonplace in the colonies.
Colonial Scientific Achievements. A largely unexplored continent provided a laboratory for the study of natural phenomena. Colonials such as John Bartram and Benjamin Franklin contributed to the accumulation of scientific knowledge. The theoretical contributions of American thinkers and scientists were modest, but involvement in the intellectual affairs of Europe provided yet another common experience for colonials.

Repercussions of Distant Wars. As European nations competed fiercely for markets and raw materials, war became a constant in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The American colonies were minor pieces in the game, but they inevitably became involved in these European wars for dominance. European powers vied for allies among the Native American tribes and raided settlements of opposing powers. The colonies paid heavily for these European conflicts. In addition to battle casualties, frontier settlers were killed in raids; and taxes went up to pay for the wars. These conflicts served to increase bad feelings between settlers in French and English colonies. More important, perhaps, Europe's colonial wars inevitably generated some friction between England and its North American colonies; however, such problems were seldom serious.

The Great War for the Empire. England and France possessed competing colonial empires in North America, but a band of wilderness had generally separated their activities. In the 1750s, however, the two powers came into direct conflict. The result was yet another colonial war; but, unlike earlier wars, this one spread from the colonies to Europe, rather than vice versa. Although English colonists outnumbered French colonists, the English effort was badly mismanaged, and England fared poorly. Not until William Pitt took over the British war effort did England's fortunes improve. Pitt recognized the potential value of North America and poured British forces and money into the war. He also promoted talented young officers such as James Wolfe. The British took Montreal in 1760, and France abandoned Canada to the British. The British also captured French and Spanish possessions in the Pacific, in the West Indies, and in India.

The Peace of Paris. Under the terms of the Treaty of Paris, signed in 1763, France gave up virtually all claims to North America. Given the extent of British victories in battle, however, the terms of the treaty were moderate. England returned captured French possessions in the Caribbean, Africa, and India. Spain got back the Philippines and Cuba, in exchange for which it ceded Florida to Great Britain.

The victory in North America was won by British troops and British gold. In contrast, the British colonies contributed relatively little money, and the performance of colonial troops was uneven. The defeat of the French seemed to tie the colonies still more closely to England.

Putting the Empire Right. Britain now controlled a far larger empire, which would be much more expensive to maintain. Pitt's expenditures for the war had doubled Britain's national debt, and it was expensive to administer a far-flung empire. The British people, however, were taxed to the limit. Moreover, the American colonies now required a more extensive system of administration. Issues such as western expansion and relations with the Indians
needed to be resolved. Many in England resented the growing wealth of the colonists. Compounding matters, even the best informed people in England remained ignorant of conditions in America. Most English leaders regarded the colonials as uncouth and inferior.

**Tightening Imperial Controls.** British attempts to deal with the problems resulting from their victory in the great war for empire eventually led to the American Revolution. After the war, the British decided to exert greater control over their American colonies. With the exception of the disastrous attempt to centralize control of the colonies in the 1680s, Britain had allowed the colonies a great degree of freedom, and the colonists had come to expect this as a right. Thus, colonists resented restrictions on their freedom.

With the removal of competition from the French, the English colonies increased their pressure on the Indians. In response, the British stationed fifteen regiments along the frontier, as much to protect the Indians from the settlers as the settlers from the Indians. A new British policy prohibited settlement across the Appalachian divide. This created further resentment among the colonists, who had plans for development of the Ohio Valley.

**The Sugar Act.** If Americans disliked the western policy, they were outraged by British attempts to raise money in America to help defray the cost of administering the colonies. The Sugar Act placed tariffs on sugar, coffee, wines, and other imported goods. Violators were tried before British naval officers in vice-admiralty courts. Colonists considered the duties to be taxation without representation. To make matters worse, the law came at a bad time. The economic boom created by the war had ended with the war, and economic depression increased the impact of the new laws.

**American Colonists Demand Rights.** The British dismissed colonial protests over the Sugar Act. Under the concept of "virtual representation," every member of Parliament stood for the interests of the entire empire. Americans probably would have resented taxes to support the imperial administration even if they had been voted by their own legislatures. The colonies failed, however, to agree on a common plan of resistance.

**The Stamp Act: The Pot Set to Boiling.** A new act of Parliament served as a catalyst to unite colonial opposition. The Stamp Act placed stiff excise taxes on all kinds of printed matter (including newspapers, legal documents, and licenses). While the Sugar Act had related to Parliament's uncontested power to control colonial trade, the Stamp Act was a direct tax. Virginia's House of Burgesses took the lead in opposing the new tax. An intercolonial Stamp Act Congress passed resolutions of protest. Irregular organizations, known as the Sons of Liberty, staged direct-action protests against the act; sometimes the protests took the form of mob violence.

**Rioters or Rebels?** In many instances, the rioting took on a social, as well as a political, character. If the colonial elite did not disapprove of the rioting, the looting associated with the protests did alarm them. Yet even in the face of hard times, the mass of people were property owners and had some say in political decisions; they had no desire to overthrow the established order.
The Stamp Act hurt the business of lawyers, merchants, and newspaper editors — people who greatly influenced public opinion. The greatest concern, however, was Britain's rejection of the principle of no taxation without representation. As British subjects, the colonists claimed "the rights of Englishmen." Passage of the Quartering Act further convinced many Americans that the actions of Parliament threatened to deprive them of those rights.

**Taxation or Tyranny?** The English people were recognized as the freest people in the world. They attributed their freedom to a balanced government. In actuality, the balance between the Crown, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons never really existed. Harmony was the result of a lack of divisive issues. To Americans, however, the actions of Parliament threatened to disrupt the balance.

In fact, British leaders looked down on the colonials but had no desire to destroy their freedom or their prosperity. At the same time, British leaders believed that the time had come to assert royal authority and to centralize imperial power. However, the colonies were no longer entirely dependent on England, and some colonists envisioned a future in which they would deal with Great Britain on terms approaching equality. British leaders, however, were not ready to deal with Americans as equals or to consider American interests on a par with their own.

Americans refused to use the stamps and boycotted British goods. The Stamp Act was repealed in March 1766.

**The Declaratory Act.** The same day it repealed the Stamp Act, Parliament passed the Declaratory Act, which asserted that Parliament could enact any law it wished with respect to the colonies. The Declaratory Act revealed the extent to which British and American views of the system had drifted apart. Words such as representation, constitution, and sovereignty had come to mean very different things on opposite sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

**The Townshend Duties.** After the repeal of the Stamp Act, the British resorted to indirect taxes to raise money. The Townshend Acts (1767) placed levies on glass, lead, paints, paper, and tea imported into the colonies. Colonists responded with a new boycott of British goods. They also made efforts to stimulate colonial manufacturing. Opposition to the Townshend duties further unified the colonies. Leaders of the resistance ranged from moderates such as John Dickinson to revolutionaries such as Samuel Adams. The British responded to protests by dissolving the Massachusetts legislature, which had emerged as a focal point of opposition to the Townshend Acts, and by transferring two regiments of troops from the frontier to Boston.
The Boston Massacre. The presence of British troops in Boston resulted in any number of minor scuffles during the winter of 1769-1770. On March 5, 1770, a crowd of rioters began throwing snowballs at a company of Redcoats. The crowd grew increasingly hostile, and the panicky troops responded by firing on it. Five Bostonians lay dead or dying. The incident infuriated the populace.

John Adams volunteered his legal services to the soldiers, most of whom were acquitted. The others were treated leniently by the standards of the day. The British also relented; all the Townshend duties except the tax on tea were repealed in April 1770. A tenuous truce lasted for two years.

The Pot Spills Over. Trouble erupted again when the British patrol boat Gaspee ran aground in Narragansett Bay in 1772. Its commander had antagonized the local populace, and that night a gang boarded the ship and burned it. When the British tried to bring the culprits to justice, no one would testify against them. Things escalated when Governor Thomas Hutchinson announced that the Crown, rather than the local legislature, would henceforth pay his salary. In response, groups of radicals formed "committees of correspondence" to plan joint action in case of trouble.

The Tea Act Crisis. The final crisis came in 1773, when Parliament, in an attempt to save the corrupt and inefficient British East India Company, agreed to remit the British tax on tea, thereby permitting an overall reduction in the price of tea. The Townshend tax, however, was retained to preserve the principle of Parliament's right to tax the colonies. Americans regarded the measure as a diabolical attempt to trick them into paying the tax on tea. Public indignation was so great that authorities in New York and Philadelphia ordered the ships carrying the tea to return to England without unloading.

In Boston, the governor was determined to collect the tax. On December 16, 1773, a group of colonists disguised as Indians dumped the tea in the harbor. England received news of the Boston Tea Party with great indignation.

From Resistance to Revolution. Parliament responded to the Boston Tea Party by passing the Coercive Acts in the spring of 1774. These acts weakened the colonial legislatures and judiciary. In addition, one of the acts closed Boston harbor until the city's citizens paid for the tea. The Intolerable Acts, as Americans called them, marked the beginning of united colonial opposition to British rule. The First Continental Congress met at Philadelphia in September 1774. Although complete independence was not yet the goal, John Adams rejected any right of Parliament to legislate for the colonies. The Congress passed a declaration condemning Britain's actions since 1763, as well as a resolution that the people take arms to defend their rights. Delegates also organized a boycott of British goods. Members of the Continental Congress might not have intended it, or even been aware of it, but they were taking part in the birth of a new nation.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The structural weakness of the British imperial administration.

2. The theory of mercantilism and its application to Britain's colonies in North America.

3. The causes and consequences of the Great Awakening.

4. The intellectual impact of the Enlightenment in America.


7. Why colonists regarded England's attempt to gain greater control over its colonies as an encroachment on their rights.

8. How the conflict with Britain over the administration of the empire led to a sense of unity among the colonies.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Was mercantilism mutually beneficial to the mother country and to the colonies? Under what circumstances might their interests diverge?

2. One might say with respect to the French and Indian War that England won the war but lost the peace (and its North American empire). Did England's victory, which secured its interests in North America, inevitably lead to the American Revolution?

3. The account of George Washington's life demonstrates that life in the Chesapeake remained precarious as late as the eighteenth century. Washington's father buried a wife, and he was only thirty-eight when his second wife buried him. George Washington also lost a brother relatively early in life. What made life in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake dangerous for men? What particular dangers did women face?

4. How did incidents such as the raid that resulted in the capture of Eunice Williams (see "American Lives") relate to the developing tensions between the American colonists and Great Britain?
5. In the debate over the colonists’ motivations (see “Debating the Past”), which position does the treatment in the textbook most closely resemble?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The process of becoming American was a complex one. Chapter 3 suggests that colonials asserted their rights both as Americans and as British subjects. John Murrin, a historian at Princeton University, has argued that, in order to become American, the colonists first had to become more English. Murrin refers to the process as Anglicization. One interesting study of this process is the legal profession in colonial Massachusetts.

Puritan settlers of Massachusetts brought with them English common law, but they also brought a keen hostility toward lawyers. The Body of Liberties of 1641 prohibited "pleading for hire" (accepting a fee to represent another in court). This restriction was dropped in 1648, but hostility to lawyers remained. In 1663 "common attorneys" were barred from the legislature.

Not surprisingly, the legal profession developed slowly under these adverse circumstances. However, in the first half of the eighteenth century the increasing complexity of imperial trade created a demand for experts who could look after the interests of merchants.

The imperial government appointed more professionalized judges, who in turn demanded a greater level of competency from those practicing in their courts. Moreover, the practice of law became an avenue to royal patronage. Sons of prominent families began to take up careers in law. College education and a period of apprenticeship with a practicing attorney became the normal means of entry into the profession by the 1740s.

A battle over the appointment of a chief justice divided professionalizing lawyers from the imperial administration. The opening round of the Revolution was thus not an effort to get out of the empire; rather, it was an effort to gain its offices.

The new chief justice, Thomas Hutchinson, needed the support of the bar, and he found a way to gain it. He offered lawyers greater dignity by requiring different robes for judges, barristers, and attorneys. New standards required a liberal education and three year's apprenticeship with a barrister before an aspirant could ask the bar to recommend him to the county court as an attorney eligible to practice in the Inferior Court. After two more years, an aspirant could seek admission as an attorney in the Superior Court. After another two years, the attorney might seek elevation to the rank of barrister, the only rank entitled to plead before the Superior Court.

The Massachusetts bar consciously restructured itself along English lines between 1760 and 1775. At the same time, lawyers emerged as leaders of the opposition to Britain's attempts to rationalize its empire. Thus, the revolutionary movement was shaped in large part by lawyers at a time when the legal profession was evolving not into something uniquely American but at a time when the legal profession was more militantly English than ever before.
On the one hand, most lawyers remained Tories. However, lawyers led and gave intellectual coherence to the opposition to the Stamp Act. In the revolutionary crisis, lawyers over fifty-five years of age were likely to join either side. Most of those under thirty sided with the opposition. Lawyers in between those ages, the majority of lawyers in the colony, sided with the Crown. These lawyers owed the growing prestige of their profession to the support of the Crown, and many of them found employment in the imperial administration.

The Stamp Act and the massive colonial opposition to it changed things for the legal profession. Lawyers led the opposition to the universally unpopular Stamp Act, and young lawyers imitated Patrick Henry, John Dickinson, and James Otis rather than the Tory majority of the profession.

Knowledge of English common law provided the colonial oppositionists with a basis for unity when there was precious little else they had in common. Carolinians, Virginians, Pennsylvanians, Yankees, and New Yorkers had more common ties with England than with each other. Until independence provided a unifying ideology, their understanding of their rights as Englishmen held the colonists together. Just as William Byrd's fanatic attempts to become an English gentleman produced something very different — an American gentleman — the increasingly assertive Anglicization of Massachusetts, and particularly its legal profession, paved the way for a revolution that created a distinctively American bar and society.

**DOCUMENTS**

*Introduction*

The Great Awakening not only rekindled religious enthusiasm in the colonies, it served as a common and unifying experience. The religious revivals of the 1740s helped to shape an American society. At the same time, the Great Awakening challenged established sources of authority in Virginia and mobilized the lower classes.

Benjamin Franklin wrote his *Autobiography* in the nineteen years after 1771. In it, he recalled the impact of hearing George Whitefield preach in 1739. Remember that Franklin was recalling an incident that took place many years earlier.

As the textbook notes, the greatest American-born revivalist was Jonathan Edwards. "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," delivered first at Northampton in 1741, was his most famous sermon. No record was kept of the sermon's impact the first time Edwards delivered it, but Reverend Stephen Williams of Longmeadow noted in his diary that when Edwards preached in Enfield, Connecticut, "the shrieks and cries were piercing and amazing." The power of the sermon derived only partly from Edwards's graphic description of Hell; Edwards preached on that topic at least as effectively on other occasions. The emotionalism of the sermon and its description of the moment of tension as man dangles over the fire produced the sermon's impact. In Edwards's sermon, God finally tires of protecting unworthy man from the flames. The most disturbing part of Edwards's sermon was its message of the insecurity of temporary protection by an all-powerful and infinitely angry being.

The third document, *Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Revival of Religion in New England*, is also by Edwards. Note the ways in which this piece, written in 1742, both reflects a sense of an American identity and acknowledges divisions in American society.


*Questions for Discussion*

1. In what ways does Franklin's account betray a certain provincialism? What has made him aware of conditions in Georgia? How does he regard the settlers of Georgia?

2. Franklin was impressed with the immediate impact of Whitefield's sermon. Would Edwards's sermon have the same kind of impact? What were the key ingredients Edwards used to sway his audience?

3. What does Edwards's *Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Religious Revival* reveal about a growing sense of a common American identity?
4. What in Edwards's *Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Religious Revival* might support the argument that the Great Awakening contained an element of social subversion?
Benjamin Franklin, *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*

In 1739 arriv'd among us from England the Rev. Mr. Whitefield, who had made himself remarkable there as an itinerant preacher....The Multitudes of all Sects and Denominations that attended his Sermons were enormous, and it was matter of Speculation to me who was one of the Number, to observe the extraordinary Influence of his Oratory on his Hearers, and how much they admir'd & respected him, notwithstanding his common Abuse of them, by assuring them they were naturally half Beasts and half Devils. It was wonderful to see the Change soon made in the Manners of our Inhabitants; from being thoughtless or indifferent about Religion, it seem'd as if all the World were growing Religious; so that one could not walk thro' the Town in an Evening without Hearing Psalms sung in different Families of every Street....Mr. Whitefield, in leaving us, went preaching all the Way thro' the Colonies to Georgia. The Settlement of that Province had lately been begun; but instead of being made with hardy industrious Husbandmen accustomed to Labor, the only People fit for such an Enterprise, it was with Families of broken Shopkeepers and other insolvent Debtors, many of indolent & idle habits, taken out of the Goals, who being set down in the Woods, unqualified for clearing Land, & unable to endure the Hardships of a new Settlement, perished in Numbers, leaving many helpless Children unprovided for. The Sight of their miserable Situation inspired the benevolent Heart of Mr. Whitefield with the idea of building an Orphan House there....Returning northward he preached up this Charity, & made large Collections; for his Eloquence had a wonderful Power over the Hearts and Purses of his Hearers, of which I myself was an Instance. I did not disapprove of the Design, but as Georgia was then destitute of Materials & Workmen, and it was propos'd to send them from Philadelphia at a great Expense, I thought it would have been better to have built the House here & Brought the Children to it. This I advis'd, but he was resolute in his first Project, and rejected my Counsel, and I thereupon refus'd to contribute. I happened soon after on one of his Sermons, in the Course of which I perceived he intended to finish with a Collection, & I silently resolved he should get nothing from me. I had in my Pocket a Handful of Copper Money, three or four silver Dollars, and five Pistoles in gold. As he proceeded I began to soften, and concluded to give the Coppers. Another Stroke of his Oratory made me asham'd of that, and determin'd me to give the Silver & he finished so admirably, that I empty'd my Pocket wholly into the Collector's Dish, Gold and all. At this Sermon there was also one of our Club, who being of my Sentiments respecting the Building in Georgia, and suspecting a Collection might be intended, had by Precaution emptied his Pockets before he came from home; towards the Conclusion of the Discourse, however, he felt a strong Desire to give, and apply'd to a Neighbor who stood near him to borrow some Money for the Purpose.
Jonathan Edwards, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God" (1741)

...This that you have heard is the case of every one of you that are out of Christ. That world of misery, that lake of burning brimstone, is extended abroad under you. There is the dreadful pit of the glowing flames of the wrath of God; there is hell's wide gaping mouth open; and you have nothing to stand upon, nor any thing to take hold of; there is nothing between you and hell but the air; 'tis only the power and mere pleasure of God that holds you up.

You probably are not sensible of this; you find you are kept out of hell, but don't see the hand of God in it, but look at other things, as the good state of your bodily constitution, your care of your own life, and the means you use for your own preservation. But indeed these things are nothing; if God should withdraw his hand, they would avail no more to keep you from falling, than the thin air to hold up a person that is suspended in it.

Your wickedness makes you as it were heavy as lead, and to tend downwards with great weight and pressure towards hell; and, if God should let you go, you would immediately sink, and swiftly descend and plunge into the bottomless gulf; and your healthy constitution, and your own care and prudence, and best contrivance, and all your righteousness, would have no more influence to uphold you and keep you out of hell, than a spider's web would have to stop a falling rock....

The God that holds you over the pit of hell, much as one holds a spider or some loathsome insect over the fire, abhors you, and is dreadfully provoked. His wrath towards you burns like fire; he looks upon you as worthy of nothing else but to be cast into the fire. He is of purer eyes than to bear you in his sight; you are ten thousand times as abominable in his eyes as the most hateful, venomous serpent is in ours. You have offended him infinitely more than ever a stubborn rebel did his prince, and yet 'tis nothing but his hand that holds you from falling into the fire every moment....

O sinner! Consider the fearful danger you are in! 'Tis a great furnace of wrath, a wide and bottomless pit, full of fire and of wrath that you are held over in the hand of that God whose wrath is provoked and incensed as much against you as against many of the damned in hell. You hang by a slender thread, with the flames of Divine wrath flashing about it, and ready every moment to singe it and burn it asunder....

It would be dreadful to suffer this fierceness and wrath of Almighty God one moment; but you must suffer it to all eternity. There will be no end to this exquisite, horrible, misery....

How dreadful is the state of those that are daily and hourly in danger of this great wrath and infinite misery! But this is the dismal case of every soul in this congregation that has not been born again, however moral and strict, sober and religious, they may otherwise be. Oh! that you would consider it, whether you be young or old!

God has made as it were two worlds here below, the old and the new (according to the names they are now called by), two great habitable continents, far separated one from the other; the latter is but newly discovered,...it has been, until of late, wholly the possession of Satan, the church of God having never been in it, as it has been in the other continent, from the beginning of the world. This new world is probably now discovered, that the new and most glorious state of God's church on earth might commence there; that God might in it begin a new world in a spiritual respect, when he creates the new heavens and new earth....

The old continent has been the source and original of mankind, in several respects. The first parents of mankind dwelt there; and there dwelt Noah and his sons; and there the second Adam was born, and was crucified and rose again; and it is probable that, in some measure to balance these things, the most glorious renovation of the world shall originate from the new continent, and the church of God in that respect be from hence. And so it is probable that that will come to pass in spirituals, that has in temporals, with respect to America; that whereas till of late, the world was supplied with its silver and gold and earthly treasures from the old continent, now it is supplied chiefly from the new, so the course of things in spiritual respects will be in like manner turned.

And it is worthy to be noted that America was discovered about the time of the reformation, or but little before: which reformation was the first thing that God did towards the glorious renovation of the world, after it had sunk into the depths of darkness and ruin, under the great antichristian apostasy. So that as soon as this new world is (as it were) created, and stands forth in view, God presently goes about doing some great thing to make way for the introduction of the church's latter day glory, that is to have its first seat in, and is to take its rise from that new world....

I observed before, that when God is about to do some great work for his church, his manner is to begin at the lower end; so when he is about to renew the whole habitable earth, it is probable that he will begin in this utmost, meanest, youngest and weakest part of it, where the church of God has been planted last of all; and so the first shall be last, and the last first....
CHAPTER 4

The American Revolution

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

"The Shot Heard Round the World." The actions of the First Continental Congress led the British government in January 1775 to decide on the use of force to control the colonies. In April, British troops moved to seize arms the Patriots had stored at Concord. Forewarned, a group of Minute Men met the British at Lexington, where an exchange of gunfire left eight Americans dead. The British moved on to Concord and destroyed the provisions stored there. On their way back to Boston, however, British troops encountered withering fire from irregulars along their line of march. Other colonies rallied quickly to support Massachusetts.

The Second Continental Congress. The Second Continental Congress met in Philadelphia on May 10. More radical than the First Congress, this meeting included a particularly distinguished group. It organized the forces gathering around Boston into a Continental Army and appointed George Washington commander in chief.

The Battle of Bunker Hill. While Congress met, the Patriots set up defenses on Bunker Hill and Breed's Hill overlooking Boston. Two assaults by the Redcoats failed to dislodge the colonists from Breed's Hill. The British carried the hill on their third try. The battle, however, cost the British more than twice the number of colonial casualties. It also reduced chances for a negotiated settlement. George III proclaimed the colonies to be "in open rebellion." The Continental Congress appeased moderates by offering one last plea to the king and then adopted the "Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms." Congress also proceeded to order an attack on Canada and set up committees to seek foreign aid and to buy munitions abroad.

The Great Declaration. Congress, and most colonists, hesitated to break with Britain. Some undoubtedly worried about their fate should they lose. Others, concerned by the actions of mobs during the protests against the Stamp Act and the Tea Act, wondered what might replace British rule. Nevertheless, two events in January 1776 pushed the colonies toward the final break: the British decision to use Hessian mercenaries and the publication of Thomas Paine's Common Sense. Paine called for complete independence and attacked the idea of monarchy. Nearly everyone in the colonies must have read or heard about Paine's pamphlet.

Richard Henry Lee of Virginia introduced a resolution declaring independence from England on June 7, 1776. Congress did not act at once; it appointed a committee to draft a justification for Lee's resolution. Congress adopted the justification, written largely by
Thomas Jefferson, on July 4. The first part of Jefferson's Declaration described the theory on which the Americans based their revolt and their creation of a republican government. The second part consisted of an indictment of George III's treatment of the colonies.

**1776: The Balance of Forces.** Americans enjoyed several advantages in their fight for independence. Americans fought on familiar terrain; England had to bring forces from across the Atlantic; England's highly professional army was ill-directed; and public opinion in England was divided.

Britain, however, possessed superior resources: a much larger population, large stocks of war materials, industrial capacity, mastery of the seas, a trained and experienced army, and a highly centralized government. Moreover, Congress had to create new political institutions during a war.

**Loyalists.** America was far from united. Loyalists, or Tories, constituted a significant segment of the colonial population. Historians’ best guess is that a fifth of the population remained Loyalists, as opposed to two-fifths who were Patriots. Differences separating Tories from Patriots were not clearly defined; however, a high proportion of those holding royal appointments and many Anglican clergymen remained loyal to the Crown, as did some merchants with ties to Britain. Whatever their strength, Loyalists lacked organization and effective leadership.

**Early British Victories.** General Howe defeated an inexperienced American army at the Battle of Long Island and again on Manhattan Island. In both instances, however, he failed to follow up his advantage and allowed Washington's army to escape. Washington learned from his defeats and forged his men into an army. Washington surprised a group of Hessian mercenaries by crossing the Delaware River on Christmas night, 1776, and attacking at daybreak. A second victory at Princeton on January 3, 1777, further bolstered American morale.

**Saratoga and the French Alliance.** The British planned an elaborate three-pronged attack to crush the colonial resistance. After wasting time trying to trap Washington's army, Howe moved to attack Philadelphia. Although he defeated Washington at the Battle of Brandywine and moved unopposed into Philadelphia, Howe's adventures doomed the British campaign. American forces dealt General Burgoyne a devastating defeat at Saratoga.

At this point, France, which had not reconciled itself to its defeat in the Seven Years' War and had been giving aid to the Americans, recognized the United States. The United States and France negotiated a commercial treaty and a treaty of alliance.

Recognizing the danger of that alliance, Lord North proposed giving in on all issues that had roused the colonies to opposition, but Parliament delayed until after Congress had ratified the treaties with France. War broke out between France and Britain.
After the loss of Philadelphia, Washington settled his army at Valley Forge for the winter. There, the army's supply system collapsed, and the men endured a winter of incredible hardship. Many officers resigned. Enlisted men, who did not have that option, deserted. Yet the army survived.

**The War Moves South.** In May 1778, the British replaced General Howe with General Clinton. Washington and Clinton fought an inconclusive battle at Monmouth Court House, but Americans held the field and could claim victory. After this, fighting in the North diminished. The British focused their attention on the South, hoping that sea power and the supposed presence of a large number of Tories would bring them victory. The British took Savannah and Charleston; however, guerrilla bands continued to harass the British forces. Congress finally permitted Washington to replace Gates with Greene, who avoided major battles with Cornwallis's larger army and bedeviled Cornwallis with a series of raids. American forces won victories at King's Mountain, Cowpens, and Guilford Court House. Cornwallis withdrew to Wilmington, North Carolina, where he could rely on the British fleet for support.

**Victory at Yorktown.** Clinton ordered Cornwallis to establish a base at Yorktown, where he could be supplied by sea. However, the French fleet cut off Cornwallis's supply and escape routes, and French and American ground forces closed the trap. Cornwallis asked for terms on October 17, 1781.

**The Peace of Paris.** Despite a promise to France not to make a separate treaty, American negotiators successfully played off competing European interests and obtained a highly favorable treaty with Britain. Britain recognized American independence, established generous boundaries, withdrew its troops from American soil, and granted fishing rights. In the final analysis, Britain preferred to have a weak English-speaking nation control the Mississippi Valley rather than France or Spain.

**Forming a National Government.** Congress was a legislative body, not a complete government. Various rivalries, particularly over claims to western lands, delayed the adoption of the Articles of Confederation. The Articles created a loose union. Each state retained its sovereignty, and the central government lacked the authority to impose taxes or to enforce the powers it possessed.

**Financing the War.** Congress and the states shared the financial burden of the war. Congress supported the Continental Army, while the states raised militias. Even though the states did not honor all of Congress's requisitions for funds, they did contribute $5.8 million in cash and more in supplies. Congress also raised large sums by borrowing. Both Congress and the states issued paper money, which caused the currency to fall in value. The people paid for much of the war through the depreciation of their money and savings. Robert Morris became superintendent of finance and restored stability to currency.
**State Republican Governments.** Most states framed new constitutions even before the Declaration of Independence. The new governments did not differ drastically from those they replaced. While they varied in detail, all new charters provided for an elected legislature, an executive, and a system of courts. In general, the power of the executive and courts was limited; power resided in the legislature. The various systems of government explicitly rejected the British concept of virtual representation. Legislators represented the interests of a particular district.

A majority of state constitutions also contained bills of rights, which protected civil liberties against all branches of government. The idea of drafting written structures of government derived from dissatisfaction with the vagueness of the unwritten British constitution and represented one of the most important innovations of the Revolutionary era.

**Social Reform.** Many states used the occasion of constitution making to introduce social and political reforms, such as legislative reapportionment and the abolition of primogeniture, entail, and quitrents. Jefferson's Statute of Religious Liberty, enacted in 1786, separated church and state in Virginia. Many states, however, continued to support religion. A number of states moved tentatively against slavery. All northern states provided for the gradual abolition of slavery, and most southern states removed restrictions on manumission.

Americans were hostile to the granting of titles and other privileges based on birth. Yet little social or economic upheaval accompanied independence. While more people of middling wealth won election to legislatures than in colonial times, high property qualifications for office holding remained the general rule. Nevertheless, the new governments were more responsive to public opinion.

**Effects of the Revolution on Women.** The late eighteenth century saw a trend toward increasing legal rights for women. For example, it became somewhat less difficult for women to obtain divorces. Still, the change in attitudes was relatively small.

The war did increase the influence of women. With so many men in the army, women managed farms, shops, and businesses. Revolutionary rhetoric stressed equality and liberty, and some women applied it to their own condition. The Revolution also provided for greater educational opportunities for women. The republican experiment required educated women, not only because women were citizens, but because women were responsible for raising the well-educated citizens necessary to the republic.

**Growth of a National Spirit.** While most modern revolutions have been caused by nationalism and have resulted in independence, the desire to be free antedated the American revolution, which gave rise to nationalist sentiments. The colonies united not out of a desire for political unity but because union offered the only hope of defeating the British. Although by the middle of the eighteenth century colonists had begun to think of themselves as distinctively American, little political nationalism existed before the Revolution. Nationalist sentiment came from a variety of sources: common sacrifices in war, common experiences during the war, service in the Continental Army and exposure to soldiers from other colonies, soldiers traveling with the army to different places, and legislators traveling to different parts of the country and listening to ideas of people from different areas. Local interests and loyalties remained strong, but certain problems demanded common solutions. Maintaining
thirteen separate postal systems or thirteen sets of diplomatic representatives was simply not practical.

**The Great Land Ordinances.** The Land Ordinance of 1785 provided for surveying western territories. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 established governments for the west and provided a mechanism for the admission of the territories as states. Territorial governments resembled British colonial governments in structure, but this was only a step toward statehood, not a permanent arrangement.

**National Heroes.** The Revolution provided Americans with their first national heroes. Benjamin Franklin was well known before the Revolution, and his support of the Patriot cause added to his fame. George Washington, however, became "the chief human symbol" of the Revolution and of a common Americanism.

**A National Culture.** The political break with Britain accentuated an already developing trend toward social and intellectual independence. The Anglican church in America became the Protestant Episcopal church. The Dutch and German Reformed churches severed ties with Europe. American Catholics gained their own bishop. The textbooks of Noah Webster emphasized American forms and usage. Writers and painters chose patriotic themes. While most citizens continued to give their first loyalty to their states, they were also increasingly aware of their common interests and proud of their common heritage.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The events that led the Continental Congress (and Americans in general) to support a break from England.

2. The ways in which the Declaration of Independence justified America's independence from England.

3. The advantages the colonies had in their war for independence and the advantages Britain had.

4. The forces that led France to support the rebellion of the American colonies.

5. Why the American negotiators were able to gain such favorable terms in Paris.

6. The basic structure of government under the Articles of Confederation.

7. The significance of the new state constitutions.

8. How the Revolution led to certain social and political reforms.

10. How the war contributed to a growing national spirit and culture.

**POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION**

1. What might have caused some people to become Loyalists?

2. The demonstrations over the Stamp Act and Tea Act tended to unleash social unrest. Why did the greater disruption of the war not lead to greater social upheaval?

3. In what ways did the Articles of Confederation reflect the experience of the American Revolution?

4. How did eighteenth-century attitudes toward military discipline and the British Articles of war (discussed in the "Re-Viewing the Past" section on the film, The Patriot) reflect the values of the Enlightenment (see "The Enlightenment in America" in Chapter 3)?

5. What evidence in the textbook supports Carl Becker’s thesis that the American Revolution was “not only about home rule but also about who should rule at home” (see the “Debating the Past” section)? Which side does the weight of the evidence support?

**LECTURE SUPPLEMENT**

The text briefly discusses the impact of Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*. In some ways, it is almost impossible to overstate the tract's importance. In a day when an average pamphlet went through one or two editions of perhaps a few thousand copies, roughly 150,000 copies of *Common Sense* sold between January and July 1776. As the text notes, virtually everyone in the colonies must have read the pamphlet or heard it discussed.

The American and French revolutions were the first mass political movements that expressed ideology in terms of rational, secular ideas rather than in terms of religion. Paine's *Common Sense* typified this. Paine created a new vocabulary, a secular language of revolution.

The publication of *Common Sense* in 1776 changed the terms of political debate. Paine began his work not with a discussion of America's relations to Britain but with an attack on hereditary rule and on the validity of monarchy. Paine always believed that the republican content of the pamphlet was more important than its call for independence. Even the Country Party in England had not challenged the institution of monarchy. Rather, it favored a government in which power was balanced between the Crown, the Lords, and
Commons. The critique offered by Country ideology was that the system had grown corrupt.

In contrast, Paine launched a savage assault on "the so much boasted Constitution of England." He attacked not only corruption but the historical legitimacy of monarchy itself. Reflecting on the origins of the English monarchy, he observed that William the Conqueror, "a French Bastard landing with an armed banditti and establishing himself king of England against the consent of the natives, [was] in plain terms a very paltry rascally original." "The plain truth," he concluded, "is that the antiquity of the English monarchy will not bear looking into."

Paine then turned his attention to the principle of hereditary rule. He contended that one "honest man" was worth more to society "and in the sight of God, than all the crowned ruffians that ever lived." Nature itself, he argued, made a mockery of hereditary kingship. "One of the strongest natural proofs of the folly of hereditary rights in kings," Paine asserted, "is that nature disproves it, otherwise she would not so frequently turn it into ridicule by giving mankind an ass for a lion."

Unlike Country ideology which had so influenced many oppositionist leaders in America, Paine rejected the notion that England's was the perfect system. The king, for Paine, was "the royal brute of England." The vaunted English constitution was "the base remains of two ancient tyrannies, compounded with some new Republican materials...the remains of monarchial tyranny in the person of the king...the remains of aristocratical tyranny in the persons of the peers."

In rejecting the notions of an ideal, uncorrupted, balanced constitution and the mythical Anglo-Saxon past, Paine stood firmly for republican government.

Paine next considered the arguments for reconciliation with England and rejected them one by one. Was it ungrateful to rebel against a parent country? If one regarded England as a parent, "the more shame upon her conduct. Even brutes do not devour their young, nor savages make war upon their own families."

Was America too weak to challenge England? Paine dismissed this as ridiculous. "There is something absurd," he wrote, "in supposing a continent to be perpetually governed by an island."

Would independence open the way for wars with Europe? Quite the contrary. Americans had no reason for enmity with France or Spain. Americans should steer clear of Europe entirely, which they could not do while imprisoned within the British Empire.

To conservatives who feared a social revolution, Paine replied that independence would inevitably come. The only question that remained was whether it would come through the legal voice of the people in Congress or through the actions of a mob.

*Common Sense* ended with a lyrical appeal: "We have it in our power to begin the world over again....the birthday of a new world is at hand....Every spot of the old world is overrun with oppression. Freedom hath been hunted round the globe. Asia and Africa have long expelled her. Europe regards her as a stranger, and England hath given her warning to depart. O! receive the fugitive and prepare in time an asylum for mankind."

Paine's pamphlet caused neither the movement for independence nor the decision for independence. It appeared, however, at a moment when Americans were ready to accept its
arguments, and Paine's powerful presentation guaranteed that his ideas would win wide acceptance.

DOCUMENTS

Introduction

The text contains a section that treats the impact of the Revolution on women. The documents in this section offer further insight into that topic.

The first document contains three letters written in 1776, two from Abigail Adams in Braintree, Massachusetts, to her husband, John, a member of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia, and one from John to Abigail.

The second document is from a broadside titled *The Sentiments of an American Woman*, published in 1780. Published after the fall of Charleston, the broadside proposed a nationwide Ladies Association to contribute to the welfare of the troops. Esther DeBerdt Reed, the wife of the president of Pennsylvania, and Sarah Franklin Bache, daughter of Benjamin Franklin, organized and led the campaign. The women raised $300,000 in inflated paper dollars. They refused to let George Washington merge their contribution with the general fund; instead, they insisted on using it to buy shirts, so that each soldier would know that he had received a contribution from the women of Philadelphia.


Questions for Discussion

1. How does Abigail Adams use the rhetoric of the American Revolution to support her claims for women?

2. What rights does Abigail Adams demand? Is her statement that women would not be "bound by any Laws in which we have no voice, or Representation" a plea for women's suffrage? If not, why not?

3. How does John Adams respond to Abigail? Does he seem to take the issues she raises seriously?

4. What kinds of roles for women are envisioned in *The Sentiments of an American Woman*?
Letters between John and Abigail Adams (1776)

Abigail Adams to John Adams, March 31, 1776

I long to hear that you have declared an independancy [sic] — and by the way in the new Code of Laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make I would desire you would Remember the Ladies, and be more generous and favourable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the Husbands. Remember all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the Ladies we are determined to foment a Rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any Laws in which we have no voice, or Representation.

That your Sex are Naturally Tyrannical is a Truth so thoroughly established as to admit of no dispute, but such of you as wish to be happy willingly give up the harsh title of Master for the more tender and endearing one of Friend. Why then, not put it out of the power of the vicious and the Lawless to use us with cruelty and indignity with impunity. Men of Sense in all Ages abhor those customs which treat us only as the vassals of your Sex. Regard us then as Beings placed by providence under your protection and in imitation of the Supreme Being make use of that power only for our happiness.

John Adams to Abigail Adams, April 14, 1776

As to Declarations of Independency, be patient. Read our Privateering Laws, and our Commercial Laws. What signifies a Word.

As to your extraordinary Code of Laws, I cannot but laugh. We have been told that our Struggle has loosened the bands of Government every where. That Children and Apprentices were disobedient — that schools and Colledges were grown turbulent — that Indians slighted their Guardians and Negroes grew insolent to their Masters. But your Letter was the first Intimation that another Tribe more numerous and powerfull than all the rest were grown discontented. — This is rather too coarse a Compliment but you are so saucy, I wont blot it out.

Depend upon it, We know better than to repeal our Masculine systems. Altho they are in full Force, you know they are little more than Theory. We dare not exert our Power in its full Latitude. We are obliged to go fair, and softly, and in Practice you know We are the subjects. We have only the Name of Masters, and rather than give up this, which would compleatly subject Us to the Despotism of the Peticoat, I hope General Washington, and all our brave Heroes would fight....
Abigail Adams to John Adams, May 7, 1776

I can not say that I think you very generous to the Ladies, for whilst you are proclaiming peace and good will to men, Emancipating all Nations, you insist upon retaining an absolute power over Wives. But you must remember that Arbitrary power is like most other things which are very hard, very liable to be broken — and notwithstanding all your wise Laws and Maxims we have it in our power not only to free our selves but to subdue our Masters, and without violence throw both your natural and legal authority at our feet —

"Charm by accepting, by submitting sway
Yet have our Humour most when we obey."
The Sentiments of an American Woman (1780)

On the commencement of actual war, the Women of America manifested a firm resolution to contribute as much as could depend on them, to the deliverance of their country. Animated by the purest patriotism, they are sensible of sorrow at this day, in not offering more than barren wishes for the success of so glorious a Revolution. They aspire to render themselves more really useful; and this sentiment is universal from the north to the south of the Thirteen United States. Our ambition is kindled by the fame of those heroines of antiquity, who have rendered their sex illustrious, and have proved to the universe, that, if the weakness of our Constitution, if opinion and manners did not forbid us to march to glory by the same paths as the Men, we should at least equal, and sometimes surpass them in our love for the public good....

...We are at least certain, that he cannot be a good citizen who will not applaud our efforts for the relief of the armies which defend our lives, our possessions, our liberty?...Shall we hesitate to wear a clothing more simple; hair dressed less elegant, while at the price of this small privation, we shall deserve your [the American soldiers'] benedictions. Who, amongst us, will not renounce with the highest pleasure, those vain ornaments, when she shall consider that the valiant defenders of America will be able to draw some advantage from the money which she may have laid out in these....The time is arrived to display the same sentiments which animated us at the beginning of the Revolution, when we renounced the use of teas, however agreeable to our taste, rather than receive them from our persecutors...
CHAPTER 5

The Federalist Era: Nationalism Triumphant

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

**Border Problems.** Only a handful of Americans found the constraints on the power of the central government imposed by the Articles of Confederation troublesome at first, but when the war ended, so did the unity it imposed. Interstate conflicts immediately reassorted themselves. Moreover, the government faced a struggle to assert control over the territory granted by the Treaty of Paris. Great Britain removed its forces from the thirteen states but refused to surrender its outposts on the frontier, citing the failure of Americans to aid in the restoration of Tory property and the collection of prewar debts. In the southwest, the Spanish closed the Mississippi River to American commerce. Even a stronger central government could not have eradicated these problems, but it might have dealt more effectively with them.

**Foreign Trade.** Freedom from British commercial restrictions proved a mixed blessing. Americans could trade with European powers, and a Far Eastern trade developed; but neither began to make up for exclusion from Britain's imperial trade. Some in England, influenced by Adam Smith, advocated free trade. However, pride and a natural advantage in trade prevented England from making concessions to a former colony. British import duties reduced American exports to England and to English colonies in the western hemisphere. At the same time, British merchants poured inexpensive manufactured goods into the United States. These problems came on top of the economic dislocation accompanying the end of the war. Congress could not pay the nation's debts; states raised taxes to pay their debts; and the entire economy was cash poor. The new nation experienced hard times from 1784 to 1786. Retaliatory tariffs on British goods would have dealt with some of the problems, but the Confederation lacked authority to levy them. A move to grant Congress power to tax imports failed when it did not gain the unanimous consent of the states.

**The Specter of Inflation.** The Continental Congress and the states paid for the Revolutionary War by printing paper money, which resulted in inflation. After the war, some states attempted to restore their credit by raising taxes and restricting new issues of money. The deflationary effect of such policies had its greatest impact on debtors, particularly farmers. Debtors clamored for the printing of more paper money. Several states yielded to this pressure; in some states the result was wild inflation.

**Daniel Shays's "Little Rebellion."** Determined to pay off the state debt and to maintain a sound currency, the Massachusetts legislature levied heavy taxes. The resulting deflation led to foreclosures. In the summer of 1786, mobs in the western part of the state began to stop foreclosures by forcibly preventing the courts from holding sessions. Daniel Shays, a veteran of the Revolutionary War, led a march on Springfield, where the "rebels" prevented the state supreme court from meeting. The state sent troops, and the rebels were routed. However,
the episode alarmed many prominent Americans, who regarded this episode as proof of the need for a stronger central government.

**To Philadelphia, and The Constitution.** Most people wanted a stronger government, and the Articles of Confederation could not provide it. In 1786, delegates from five states met in Annapolis to discuss common problems. Alexander Hamilton, who advocated a strong central government, proposed calling another convention for the following year to consider constitutional reform. The meeting approved Hamilton's suggestion, and all states except Rhode Island sent delegates to the convention in Philadelphia.

**The Great Convention.** A remarkably talented group of delegates assembled in Philadelphia to revise the Articles of Confederation. The framers of the Constitution agreed on basic principles. There should be a federal system with independent state governments and a national government. The government should be republican in nature, drawing its authority from the people. No group within the society should dominate. The framers were suspicious of power and sought to protect the interests of minorities.

**The Compromises that Produced the Constitution.** After voting to establish a national government, the delegates faced two problems: what powers should this government be granted and who would control it? The first question generated relatively little disagreement. Delegates granted the central government the right to levy taxes, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, and to raise and maintain an army and navy. The second question proved more difficult. Larger states argued for representation based on population. Smaller states wanted equal representation for each state. The Great Compromise created a lower house based on population and an upper house in which each state had two representatives. The issue of slavery occasioned another struggle and another compromise. Three-fifths of slaves were counted for purposes of taxation and representation, and Congress was prohibited from outlawing the slave trade until 1808.

The creation of a powerful president was the most radical departure from past practice. Only faith in Washington and the assumption that he would be the first president enabled the delegates to go so far. The delegates also established a third branch of government — the judiciary. The Founders worried that the powerful new government might be misused, so they created a system of "checks and balances" to limit the authority of any one branch.

**Ratifying the Constitution.** The framers provided that their handiwork be ratified by special state conventions. This gave the people a voice and bypassed state legislatures. The new Constitution would take effect when nine states ratified it. Federalists (supporters of the Constitution) and Anti-federalists (their opponents) vied for support in the state conventions. It is difficult to distinguish between Federalists and Anti-federalists on the basis of economic status, social status, or even commitment to democratic ideals. Federalists tended to be more substantial individuals; Anti-Federalists were more likely to be small farmers and debtors.
In general, the Federalists were better organized than their opponents. The *Federalist Papers* brilliantly explained and defended the proposed new system. Most states ratified the Constitution readily once its backers agreed to add amendments guaranteeing the civil liberties of the people against encroachments by the national government.

**Washington as President.** The first electoral college made George Washington its unanimous choice. Washington was a strong, firm, dignified, conscientious, but cautious, president. He was acutely aware that each of his actions would establish a precedent. Along those lines, he meticulously honored the separation of powers. Washington picked his advisors based on competence and made a practice of calling his department heads together for general advice. Within the cabinet, factions began to form around Jefferson and Hamilton.

**Congress Under Way.** The first Congress created various departments and a federal judiciary. It also passed the first ten amendments to the Constitution. Known as the Bill of Rights, these amendments protected the freedom of speech, the press, and religion; reaffirmed the right to trial by jury; guaranteed the right to bear arms; prohibited unreasonable searches and seizures; and protected against self-incrimination. It also guaranteed due process of law. The Tenth Amendment reserved to the states powers not specifically delegated to the United States or denied to the states by the Constitution.

**Hamilton and Financial Reform.** As one of its first acts, Congress imposed a tariff on foreign imports. Raising money for current expenses, however, was not so serious a problem as the large national debt. Congress delegated to Alexander Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury, the task of straightening out the nation's financial mess. Hamilton proved to be a farsighted economic planner. He suggested that the debt be funded at par and that the United States assume remaining state debts. Congress went along because it had no other choice. Southern states stood to lose, since they had already paid off most of their obligations from the Revolutionary War. Madison and Jefferson agreed to support Hamilton's plan in exchange for the latter's support for a plan to locate the permanent national capital on the banks of the Potomac River.

Hamilton also proposed a national bank. Like his other proposals, this one benefited the commercial classes. Congress passed a bill creating the bank, but Washington hesitated to sign it. Jefferson argued that the Constitution did not specifically authorize Congress to charter corporations or engage in banking. Hamilton countered that the bank fell within the "implied powers" of Congress. Washington accepted Hamilton's reasoning, and the bank became an immediate success.

Beyond the immediate financial crisis, Hamilton hoped to change an agricultural nation into one with a complex, self-sufficient economy. Toward that end, his *Report on Manufactures* issued a bold call for economic planning. A majority in Congress would not go so far, although many of the specific tariffs Hamilton recommended did become law.

**The Ohio Country: A Dark and Bloody Ground.** Western issues continued to plague the new country. The British continued to occupy their forts, and western Indians resisted settlers encroaching on their hunting grounds. When white settlers moved into the land north of the Ohio River, the Indians drove the whites back. Westerners believed that the federal
government was ignoring their interests. Compounding their discontent was the imposition of a federal excise tax on whiskey. The tax fell especially hard on westerners, who not only drank heavily but who turned much of their grain into spirits to cope with the high cost of transportation. Resistance to the tax was especially intense in western Pennsylvania.

**Revolution in France.** The French Revolution and subsequent European wars affected America. The Alliance of 1778 obligated the United States to defend French possessions in the Americas; however, with the British in Canada and the Spanish to the west and south, belligerence entailed grave risks. Washington issued a proclamation of neutrality. France sent Edmond Genet to the United States to seek support. In flagrant violation of American neutrality, Genet licensed American vessels as privateers and commissioned Americans to mount military expeditions against British and Spanish possessions in North America. Washington requested that France recall Genet.

The European war increased demand for American products, but it also led both France and Britain to attack American shipping. The larger British fleet caused more damage. American resentment flared, but Washington attempted to negotiate a settlement with the British.

**Federalists and Republicans: The Rise of Political Parties.** Washington enjoyed universal admiration, and his position as head of government limited partisanship. However, his principal advisors, Jefferson and Hamilton, disagreed on fundamental issues, and they became leaders around whom political parties coalesced. Jefferson's opposition to Hamilton's Bank of the United States became the first seriously divisive issue. Disagreement over the French Revolution and American policy toward France widened the split between parties. Jefferson and the Republicans supported France; Federalists backed the British.

**1794: Crisis and Resolution.** Several events in 1794 brought partisan conflict to a peak. Attempts to collect the whiskey tax in Pennsylvania resulted in violence. In July, 7,000 rebels converged on Pittsburgh and threatened to burn the town. Only the sight of federal artillery and the liberal dispensation of whiskey turned them away. Washington was determined to enforce the law and mustered a large army. He marched westward, but, when he arrived, the rebels had dispersed. This, coupled with the defeat of the Indians at the Battle of Fallen Timbers, helped pacify the west.

**Jay's Treaty.** Washington sent John Jay to negotiate a treaty settling differences with England. Although American indebtedness to England and the fear of a Franco-American alliance inclined the British to reach an accommodation with the United States, recent British victories in the war with France made them less disposed to make concessions. Thus, Jay obtained only one major concession. The British agreed to evacuate the posts in the west. They rejected, however, Jay's attempts to gain recognition of neutral rights on the high seas. For his part, Jay agreed that America would not impose discriminatory duties on British
goods and that America would pay pre-Revolutionary debts. The terms of the treaty raised a storm of opposition at home.

1795: All's Well That Ends Well. Washington decided not to repudiate the Jay Treaty, and the Senate ratified it in 1795. Jay's Treaty became the basis for regularization of relations with Britain. Perhaps as important, Spain, fearing an Anglo-American alliance, offered the United States free navigation of the Mississippi and the right of deposit at New Orleans. The treaty that formalized this arrangement, known as Pinckney's Treaty, also settled the disputed boundary between Spanish Florida and the United States.

The agreements with European powers ended for the moment European pressure on the region beyond the Appalachians. This, along with the Treaty of Greenville, signed with the Indians after the Battle of Fallen Timbers, opened the west to settlement. Before the decade ended, Kentucky and Tennessee became states, and the Mississippi and Indiana territories were organized.

Washington's Farewell. The settlement of western and European problems did not end partisan conflict at home. Although Washington remained a symbol of national unity, he usually sided with Hamilton on issues of finance and foreign policy. At the end of his second term, Washington decided to retire. In his farewell address, he warned against partisanship at home and permanent alliances abroad.

The Election of 1796. In spite of Washington's warning against partisanship, his retirement opened the gates for partisan conflict. In the race to succeed Washington, Jefferson represented the Republicans, but the Federalists considered Hamilton too controversial. The Federalists therefore nominated John Adams for president and Thomas Pinckney for vice-president. Adams won, but partisan bickering split the Federalist vote for vice-president, so Jefferson received the second highest total and therefore became vice-president. The Federalists continued to quarrel among themselves, and Adams, although honest and able, was also caustic and brutally frank. He could not unite a bickering party.

The XYZ Affair. In retaliation for the Jay Treaty (and also to influence the election), the French attacked American shipping. These attacks continued after Adams took office. Adams sent a commission to France to negotiate a settlement. The mission collapsed when three French agents (X, Y, and Z) demanded a bribe before making a deal and the commissioners refused. Adams released the commissioners' report, which caused a furor. The report embarrassed the Republicans; and Congress, controlled by the Federalists, abrogated the alliance with France and began to make preparations for war. Although a declaration of war would have been immensely popular, Adams contented himself with a buildup of the armed forces.

The Alien and Sedition Acts. Federalists feared that Republicans would side with France if war broke out. In addition, refugees from both sides of the European war flocked to the United States. Partly out of fear of subversion and partly in an effort to smash their political opponents, Federalists pushed a series of repressive measures through Congress in 1798. The Naturalization Act increased the residence requirement for citizenship. The Alien
Enemies Act empowered the president to arrest or expel aliens in time of declared war; and the Sedition Act made it a crime "to impede the operation of any law," to instigate insurrection, or to publish "false, scandalous and malicious" criticism of government officials. As the election of 1800 neared, Federalists attempted to silence leading Republican newspapers.

**The Kentucky and Virginia Resolves.** Jefferson did not object to state sedition laws, but he believed that the Alien and Sedition Acts violated the First Amendment. He and Madison drew up resolutions arguing that the laws were unconstitutional. Jefferson further argued that states could declare a law of Congress unconstitutional. Neither Virginia nor Kentucky tried to implement these resolves; Jefferson and Madison were in fact launching Jefferson's campaign for president, not advancing an extreme theory of states' rights.

Taken aback by the American reaction, France offered negotiations, and Adams accepted the offer. Adams resisted strong pressure from his party for a war. Negotiators signed the Convention of 1800, which abrogated the Franco-American treaties of 1778.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The problems that kept the west in a state of unrest.
2. The economic consequences of the Revolution.
3. The events that led to the Constitutional Convention.
4. The major compromises that shaped the Constitution.
5. The strengths of Washington's presidency.
6. Hamilton's financial reforms.
7. How foreign affairs influenced politics in the early republic.
8. The origins of political parties.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. The Constitution is now the oldest written document of government in the world. What has enabled it to survive as the basic instrument of government of a country that evolved from thirteen states huddled on the eastern seaboard into a nation that spans a continent?

2. Hamilton and Jefferson staked out positions on constitutional interpretation and approaches to federalism that have dominated political debate to this day. What were their respective positions on these issues? What echoes of their debate are evident today?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENTS

The First Among the Founders

The text notes that "Washington was less brilliant than either Hamilton or Jefferson but wiser." Historians have pondered for generations the greatness of Washington.

The American Revolution produced an extraordinary array of talented individuals. Any list of great Americans would, of necessity, contain an astonishingly large proportion of people whose careers began or climaxed with the Revolution. For sheer ability, it would be difficult indeed to come up with a list of American leaders to equal Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, Franklin, and Madison. Given the talents of Franklin, Jefferson, Hamilton, and Madison in particular, one cannot help but wonder at the preeminent place occupied by Washington. What was Washington's special genius?

Assessing Washington is no easy task. Perhaps even more than any other American leader, he remains as difficult to approach today as he was in his lifetime. One finds warmth, humanity, and humor in the letters of Jefferson, Franklin, and Lincoln. Anecdotes draw us to them. Yet in Washington's case, anecdotes keep us at arm's length. One example should suffice. At the Constitutional Convention, a group of Washington's friends from the Revolution were discussing his reserved and remote manner, even with his most intimate acquaintances. Gouverneur Morris disagreed. He claimed that he could be as familiar with Washington as with any other friend. Hamilton called his bluff and offered to provide dinner and the best wine for a dozen of those present if, at Washington's next reception, Morris would simply walk up to Washington, slap him on the shoulder, and say: "My dear General, how happy I am to see you look so well." Not long after, Washington held a reception. With a number of the plotters present, Morris arrived, walked up to Washington, placed his hand on the great man's shoulder, and said, "My dear General, I am very happy to see you look so well." Washington removed the hand, stepped back, and fixed a silent stare on Morris that would have cooled hell. No one ever tried anything of the sort again.

While Washington's response seems rather exaggerated, that icy reserve was an integral part of what Edmund Morgan has called the genius of George Washington. Morgan has suggested that the real genius of Washington was his understanding of power, an understanding unmatched by any of his contemporaries. At a time when his country needed
military power above all else and had precious little, Washington made do with what was available. After the Revolution, facing hostile powers in a war-torn world, Washington used European rivalries to get the best possible results for a young and weak nation.

Washington was not a thinker or an intellectual. He was not especially original. He contributed nothing to the amazingly rich political thought of the Revolution. But he understood power. He could take command. And, in his exercise of leadership, he nourished the aloofness that became his trademark. Washington's advice to a new colonel in the Continental Army revealed his understanding of leadership. "Be easy and condescending in your deportment to your officers," he wrote, "but not too familiar, lest you subject yourself to a want of that respect, which is necessary to support a proper command." As Washington understood it, his remoteness was necessary to the power he had to exercise.

Washington also understood military power. He had no great military experience before 1775. His participation in the French and Indian War did, however, expose him to conditions of warfare on the North American continent. While at Fort Ligonier, he wrote in his diary that, if in charge, he would dress his men in Indian clothes, travel light, and fight like Indians. He quickly recognized the significance of geography in a way his opponents never did. As the text points out, Washington almost got trapped on Long Island, and he never made that mistake again. Indeed, in 1777 he warned a subordinate not to place his forces in Yorktown because forces at that location could too easily be isolated. When Cornwallis made that mistake four years later, Washington pounced.

Washington ignored the eighteenth-century doctrine of holding territory. He knew that the British could take any territory they wanted, but he also knew that so long as the Continental Army remained in the field, possession of territory would avail the British little.

Aside from his abilities in the field, Washington understood the political basis of military power. Washington fruitlessly pleaded with Congress to authorize an army of regulars. Yet he never took his complaints over the head of Congress to the people, as his enormous popularity would have enabled him to do. Washington never doubted that the United States must be a republic or that the military must be subordinate to civilian authority.

After the Revolution, Washington wanted to respond to what he regarded as England's economic warfare against the new nation by barring English ships. Under the Articles of Confederation, Congress did not have the power to do so, but Washington bemoaned the fact that Congress did not even use the powers it did have. Washington also saw the disorders of the Confederation period as evidence of the need for a strong government.

During his presidency, when the Whiskey Rebellion broke out, Washington made his point. His understanding of power and self-interest guided the new nation through the perilous waters of diplomacy during the French Revolution and European wars.

Washington lacked the true genius of Jefferson, the brilliance of Hamilton and Madison. But in the comprehension and use of power, he excelled them all.

The Yellow Fever Epidemic in Philadelphia, 1793

Yellow fever hit Philadelphia in August of 1793. By the time the epidemic had run its course in November, it had killed ten percent of the city's population. An additional forty-five percent of the city's people fled in an attempt to escape the disease. America's leading city virtually shut down. City services ground to a virtual halt; the port was closed; people were afraid to leave their homes.

Caused by a virus spread by female mosquitoes, yellow fever is a terrifying disease. Victims feel flush and then chilled; they usually suffer from a severe headache or backache. In most cases, patients go into remission after two or three days. In some cases, however, the remission is followed by jaundice and hallucinations. Then, internal hemorrhaging is followed by convulsions and, in most cases, death.

Ironically, in this instance the disease struck the leading center of medicine in the young republic. The most famous physician in America, Dr. Benjamin Rush (a signer of the Declaration of Independence) lived there. Several of America's leading medical institutions were located in the city, including the College of Physicians, the Pennsylvania Hospital, the Philadelphia Dispensary, and the medical department of the University of Pennsylvania. It would be years, however, before the medical profession understood even the cause of the disease, much less how to treat it.

Some doctors in the late eighteenth century attributed the disease to "miasma" caused by the rotting refuse in the streets of the city and believed that the disease was carried through the air. Most prominent among these was Rush. Other doctors thought that the disease was contagious. The latter group tended to place the blame for the outbreak in Philadelphia on two thousand French refugees who had fled revolution and an outbreak of yellow fever in Haiti.

Curiously enough, the dispute became political. In general, doctors who held that the disease was contagious tended to be Federalists. The execution of Louis XVI and the Reign of Terror horrified most Federalists, and, not coincidentally, they were quick to blame the epidemic on the French refugees. Those like Rush, who blamed the disease on "miasma," tended to be Jeffersonian Republicans, who in most cases were pro-French and supported the revolutionary cause.

Even the treatments prescribed fell out along political lines. Some doctors favored stimulants, such as quinine bark, wine, and cold baths. Others prescribed bleeding (drawing substantial amounts of the patient's blood) and purges. Rush advocated bleeding, but Alexander Hamilton survived a case of yellow fever and published a testimonial to the wine and bark cure with which a Federalist doctor had treated him. Never one to let things rest,
Hamilton also published an article attacking Rush and ridiculing his approach to treating the disease. Thus, the wine and bark treatment became the Federalist remedy; bleeding and purges became the Republican cure.

Rush played another interesting role during the outbreak. He initially believed that African Americans were immune to the disease. Based on his theory, the city's government called on the black community to supply men to bury the dead and women to act as nurses. Led by Absalom Jones and Richard Allen, hundreds of African Americans responded. Rush even trained some African Americans to bleed patients. However, the willingness of Philadelphia's black population to help the larger community had frightful costs. As Rush wrote, "it was not long after these worthy Africans undertook the execution of their humane offer of services to the sick before I was convinced I had been mistaken. They took the disease in common with the white population, and many of them died with it."

Especially galling to African Americans was the publication of a pamphlet by Matthew Carey accusing them of looting the dead and charging exorbitant fees for their services. Undoubtedly some blacks plundered and extorted excessive fees; the majority, however, provided necessary services that whites would not and did so for reasonable compensation (when not for free). Jones and Allen published a reply to Carey, titled *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Black People During the Late Awful Calamity in Philadelphia in the Year 1793*. They pointed out that the Free African Society (founded to provide relief of destitute members of the black community) went into debt to provide services for white Philadelphians; the cost of carriers and coffins exceeded the compensation for burying the dead. Further, Jones and Allen had buried the poor without charging. They also observed that while African Americans assumed these tasks no whites would take on, Carey had fled the city and then profited from the publication of tracts on the fever.

The outbreak of the epidemic disrupted the normal functioning of Philadelphia's society and economy. Part of the story was the fear generated by a lack of understanding of the disease and the utter inability of the medical profession to treat it.

The actual cause of yellow fever would not be discovered until the early twentieth century, when the United States government sent a commission led by Major Walter Reed (a professor of bacteriology at the Army Medical School) to Cuba to investigate the causes of the disease. The commission discovered that it was transmitted by mosquitoes.

Introduction

The Revolution set in motion changes unanticipated by its architects. Its rhetoric inspired aspirations by women and free blacks for equal treatment and for education. The years after the Revolution witnessed a great expansion of educational opportunity, based on the belief that a republic required a well-educated citizenry to function properly. Women's education received a boost from this idea. The ideal republican woman was a patriot, a virtuous wife, and the mother and teacher of good citizens of the republic. Nevertheless, women's education lagged far behind that of men. Blacks enjoyed even less opportunity.

The first document is from Molly Wallace's Valedictory Oration to the Young Ladies Academy in Philadelphia in 1792. The Young Ladies Academy offered girls a similar curriculum to that offered in schools for boys. Men founded and taught in the school. Although the education was similar to that available to boys, the young ladies were expected to apply that education within the home.

The second document is a petition to the Massachusetts legislature protesting the exclusion of blacks from public education. One of the organizers of the petition was Prince Hall, a native of Barbados who came to Massachusetts at the age of 17 in 1765. Hall served in the army during the Revolution and became a Methodist minister after the War. He also founded the Negro Masonic Order.


Questions for Discussion

1. Toward what use does Molly Wallace expect young women to put their skills as orators? What might the "more humble and milder scenes...in which a woman may display her elocution" be? What venues are clearly off limits to women? Is there any connection between her ideas and the fact that men founded and taught in the school?

2. On what basis do the black citizens of Boston rest their claim to an equal education?

3. What connections can be drawn between the ideology of the Revolution, the arguments for women's education, and the blacks' petition for access to public schools?
Valedictory Oration, Delivered by Miss Molly Wallace, June 20, 1792

The silent and solemn attention of a respectable audience, has often, at the beginning of discourses intimidated, even veterans, in the art of public elocution. What then must my situation be, when my sex, my youth and inexperience all conspire to make me tremble at the talk which I have undertaken?...With some, however, it has been made a question, whether we ought ever to appear in so public a manner. Our natural timidity, the domestic situation to which by nature and custom we seem destined, are, urged as arguments against what I have now undertaken: — Many sarcastical observations have been handed out against female oratory: But to what do they amount? Do they not plainly inform us, that, because we are females, we ought therefore to be deprived of what is perhaps the most effectual means of acquiring a just, natural and graceful delivery? No one will pretend to deny, that we should be taught to read in the best manner. And if to read, why not to speak?...But yet it might be asked, what, has a female character to do with declamation? That she should harangue at the head of an Army, in the Senate, or before a popular Assembly, is not pretended, neither is it requested that she ought to be an adept in the stormy and contentious eloquence of the bar, or in the abstract and subtle reasoning of the Senate; — we look not for a female Pitt, Cicero, or Demosthenes.

There are more humble and milder scenes than those which I have mentioned, in which a woman may display her elocution. There are numerous topics, on which she may discourse without impropriety, in the discussion of which, she may instruct and please others, and in which she may exercise and improve her own understanding. After all, we do not expect women should become perfect orators. Why then should they be taught to speak in public? This question may possibly be answered by asking several others.

Why is a boy diligently and carefully taught the Latin, the Greek, or the Hebrew language, in which he will seldom have occasion, either to write or to converse? Why is he taught to demonstrate the propositions of Euclid, when during his whole life, he will not perhaps make use of one of them? Are we taught to dance merely for the sake of becoming dancers? No, certainly. These things are commonly studied, more on account of the habits, which the learning of them establishes, than on account of any important advantages which the mere knowledge of them can afford. So a young lady, from the exercise of speaking before a properly selected audience, may acquire some valuable habits, which, otherwise she can obtain from no examples, and that no precept can give. But, this exercise can with propriety be performed only before a select audience: a promiscuous and indiscriminate one, for obvious reasons, would be absolutely unsuitable, and should always be carefully avoided....
Petition for Equal Education, October 17, 1787

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Bay, in General Court assembled.

The petition of a great number of blacks, freemen of this Commonwealth, humbly sheweth, that your petitioners are held in common with other freemen of this town and Commonwealth and have never been backward in paying our proportionate part of the burdens under which they have, or may labor under; and as we are willing to pay our equal part of these burdens, we are of the humble opinion that we have the right to enjoy the privileges of free men. But that we do not will appear in many instances, and we beg leave to mention one out of many, and that is of the education of our children which now receive no benefit from the free schools in the town of Boston, which we think is a great grievance, as by woeful experience we now feel the want of a common education. We, therefore, must fear for our rising offspring to see them in ignorance in a land of gospel light when there is provision made for them as well as others and yet can't enjoy them, and for no other reason can be given than they are black...

We therefore pray your Honors that you would in your wisdom make some provision...for the education of our dear children. And in duty bound shall ever pray.
CHAPTER 6

Jeffersonian Democracy

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The Federalist Contribution. The Republicans won the election of 1800, but because the electors did not distinguish between president and vice-president, Jefferson and Burr received the same number of votes. This threw the election into the House of Representatives. Hamilton, who exerted considerable influence on Federalist members of Congress, threw his support to Jefferson. As a result, Jefferson won the presidency.

The Federalists' major contribution consisted of the principles and governmental structure set forth in the Constitution. They demonstrated moderation in implementing those principles by establishing a strong central government while making concessions to localism. The Federalists also established a sound financial system and encouraged the development of a diversified economy. In foreign affairs, they sought accommodation with Britain and took a cautious approach toward the French Revolution.

Jefferson called his victory in 1800 a revolution, but the real significance of the election was that it was not a revolution. Control of the government changed hands in a democratic and orderly fashion.

Thomas Jefferson: Political Theorist. Jefferson derived his political philosophy from the ideas of the Enlightenment and his experience as a southern planter. Although he believed that humans were inherently selfish, he also believed that individuals in society could be improved by the application of reason. Unlike Hamilton, he did not believe that the wealthy had a monopoly on talent. He viewed all government as a constant threat to individual freedom. To counter this threat, he relied on democracy and the protection of personal liberties. Jefferson distrusted Hamilton's admiration for British society, his plans to centralize the American government, and his efforts to aid commerce and development.

Jefferson as President. Jefferson attempted to temper partisan factionalism. He repealed the Naturalization Act and allowed the Alien and Sedition Acts to expire, but he made no attempt to destroy Hamilton's financial structure. He disdained the formality of previous administrations. Although Jefferson could be partisan (he drew his cabinet exclusively from his own party and pressed Congress to enact his legislative program), he attempted to bring all into his political camp.

Jefferson's Attack on the Judiciary. As Adams's administration expired, Congress passed the Judiciary Act of 1801, which created a number of new federal judgeships. Adams filled the new judgeships with Federalists. Upon gaining power, the Republicans immediately repealed the act. Moreover, not all of the commissions Adams signed had been delivered. Jefferson ordered the undelivered commissions withheld. One of Adams's appointees, Marbury, petitioned the Supreme Court to force the new secretary of state, Madison, to give him his judicial commission. In Marbury v. Madison, Chief Justice John Marshall decided
that a clause contained in the Judiciary Act violated the Constitution. Therefore, even though Marbury had a right to the commission, the Supreme Court could not force Madison to give it to him. The case established the power of the federal judiciary to invalidate federal laws.

The Marbury case made Jefferson even more determined to strike at the Federalist-dominated courts. After obtaining the impeachment and conviction of a clearly unfit district judge, John Pickering, Jefferson went after Samuel Chase, an associate justice of the Supreme Court. Although the House of Representatives impeached Chase, the Senate found that his actions did not constitute "high crimes and misdemeanors."

The Barbary Pirates. Jefferson refused to continue the policy of paying tribute to North African pirates to prevent the seizure of American ships, making the United States the only maritime nation to refuse to pay protection money to the Barbary pirates. The pasha of Tripoli declared war on the United States in 1801, and Jefferson dispatched a naval squadron to the Mediterranean. Although the squadron failed to defeat the pirates, the pasha agreed to a treaty more favorable to the United States.

The Louisiana Purchase. Jefferson acquired the Louisiana Territory—the region between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains—from France in 1803 for $15 million. Spain had given the territory back to France in 1800. Before relinquishing the area, however, Spain revoked the right of deposit at New Orleans. This action and fear of Napoleon's designs in the western hemisphere led Jefferson to attempt to buy New Orleans. Napoleon's need for money to finance his war in Europe and the failure of the French to put down a slave revolt in Haiti led the emperor to sell all of Louisiana. Jefferson had doubts about the constitutionality of the Louisiana Purchase but decided to go ahead anyway. With the support of some prominent Federalists, the treaty won ratification in the Senate.

The Federalists Discredited. The west and south solidly supported Jefferson, and the president's popularity was growing in the north as well. With the addition of new states in the west, New England's power would decline still further. A small group of die-hard Federalists in New England began to consider secession. Even among Federalists, this group had little support, and their attempt to gain control of New York's state government failed. As a result of the campaign, Burr challenged Hamilton to a duel and killed him.

Lewis and Clark. In 1803, Jefferson sent an expedition under Meriwether Lewis and William Clark to explore the Louisiana Territory. The expedition left St. Louis in the Spring of 1804 and traveled up the Missouri River. They eventually made it to the Pacific coast and returned to St. Louis in 1806. Lewis and Clark located passes through the Rocky Mountains, established friendly relations with several Indian tribes, and brought back a wealth of information about the territory and its inhabitants.

Jeffersonian Democracy. Jefferson's policies and talents created Jeffersonian democracy. He proved that a democrat could maintain a stable administration. By accepting Federalist ideas on public finance, he contributed to prosperity among all classes. All of this eroded support for the Federalists.
The Burr Conspiracy. Despite his popular support, Jefferson encountered problems at home and abroad. In the absence of an effective opposition party, factionalism emerged within the Republican party. Jefferson's political assaults on Burr contributed to the latter's decision to flirt with treason. Just what Burr had in mind remains unclear, beyond his intent to carve out a western empire for himself. Burr's expedition failed when a confederate betrayed him, and Burr was captured and charged with treason. Marshall's narrow construction of treason led to Burr's acquittal and increased the animosity between Jefferson and the Chief Justice.

Napoleon and the British. Until 1806, the war between Britain and France stimulated the American economy; Americans provided goods and vessels to the combatants. Napoleon resorted to economic warfare against Britain, and the British retaliated with the Orders in Council, which blockaded most continental ports and barred foreign vessels from them unless the vessels first stopped at a British port and paid customs duties. Napoleon then declared that any vessel submitting to the British rules became English property and therefore subject to seizure. When the war first broke out, the danger of capture convinced merchant vessels from belligerent countries to abandon colonial trade, which fell into American hands. Americans tried to circumvent restrictions by transshipping and re-exporting colonial goods as American goods carried on American ships. The British declared such practices illegal, and thereby threatened American prosperity.

The Impressment Controversy. The British practice of impressment threatened America's rights as a neutral country. Jefferson and his administration conceded Britain the right to impress British subjects from American ships. The British, however, also impressed naturalized Americans and even native-born American citizens. Jefferson believed in standing up for one's rights but hated the thought of war. Moreover, as a southerner, he was probably less sensitive to New England's interests than he might have been. In addition, the tiny navy Jefferson maintained could do little to enforce American rights on the high seas.

The Embargo Act. When the British fired on an American warship and impressed three deserters from it, Jefferson ordered all British warships out of American waters and Congress passed the Embargo Act, which prohibited all exports. Jefferson hoped the embargo would put economic pressure on Britain and France, but the act severely damaged the American economy. American merchants resented the act and frequently violated it. In Jefferson's last months as president, Congress repealed the Embargo Act and replaced it with the Non-Intercourse Act, which forbade trade only with Britain and France and authorized the president to end the boycott against either power if it stopped violating the rights of Americans.
POIPTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The origin of the Twelfth Amendment.


3. The reasons for Jefferson's distrust of the judiciary.

4. Why Jefferson was able to purchase the entire Louisiana territory from France.

5. The constitutional issues involved in the Louisiana Purchase.

6. The emerging dominance of the Republican party and the decline of the Federalists.

7. The impact of the European war on America's economy.

8. The points of conflict between the United States and Great Britain.


POIPTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. The election of 1800 marked the first peaceful transfer of power from one party to another. Why this was so merits consideration. Could it be attributed simply to the genius of the Constitution? To the commitment of the Founding Fathers to their country and to the democratic process? To the fact that, despite the heated rhetoric, the differences between Federalists and Republicans were not all that great?

2. Ironically, as a result of Jefferson's attack on the judiciary, the decision in *Marbury v. Madison* and the failure to remove Justice Chase helped to establish the federal judiciary as a powerful and independent third branch of government. Discuss.

3. What factors prompted Jefferson to sponsor the Lewis and Clark expedition? (See The "Mapping the Past" section.)

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

Thomas Jefferson fascinated and perplexed his opponents as well as his supporters and has continued to fascinate historians ever since. In many ways, he was the greatest individual the Revolution produced; certainly he was its greatest mind. The text discusses Jefferson's political ideology largely as it contrasted with Hamilton's; however, Jefferson's thought was complex and deserves further discussion.
Jefferson was a man of many and considerable talents. He mastered Greek and Latin by the age of eighteen and spoke French and Italian as well. He studied some forty Indian languages, attempted to reform English spelling, and commanded a true mastery of writing in his own language. In addition, he was an accomplished musician, an excellent architect, and a scientist. Indeed, he probably knew more of applied science than any of his contemporaries, including Franklin and Paine. All told, this comprised a very different set of skills from Washington's. In contrast to Washington's pragmatic talents, Jefferson possessed the mind of a scholar and an overpowering intellect.

For all of his abilities, however, Jefferson never wrote a comprehensive political treatise. He wrote brilliant documents: the Declaration of Independence, the Kentucky Resolves, Virginia's Act for Establishing a Religious Freedom, his presidential addresses to Congress. However, all were immediate responses to particular situations. They set forth Jefferson's thoughts on a given matter and perhaps how the matter related to larger issues. Jefferson left no great synthesis.

Jefferson was a radical democrat who believed in a representative, republican form of government. He once remarked that the tree of liberty must be watered periodically with the blood of tyrants, and he suggested that a rebellion every twenty years or so would be an excellent thing.

For Jefferson, the core of democracy was liberty. Although a student of eighteenth-century European philosophy, Jefferson's feet were planted firmly in America. "The mass of mankind," he wrote, "has not been born with saddles on their back, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God." The notion of hereditary privilege appalled him.

While in Europe, I often amused myself with contemplating the characters of the then reigning sovereigns....Louis XVI was a fool....The King of Spain was a fool, and of Naples the same. They passed their lives in hunting....The King of Sardinia was a fool....The Queen of Portugal...was an idiot by nature. And so was the King of Denmark....The King of Prussia, successor to the great Frederick, was a mere hog in body as well as in mind. Gustavus of Sweden and Joseph of Austria were really crazy, and George of England...was in straight waistcoat....These animals had become without mind and powerless.

Jefferson feared government as a potential menace and accepted it only as a necessary evil. He said that if faced with a choice between despotism and anarchy, he would choose anarchy. "The sheep," he observed, "are happier of themselves than under the care of wolves." Unlike Madison, Jefferson never fully reconciled himself to power.

Jefferson thought long about how to prevent government from becoming an oppressor. The best defense against tyranny, he concluded, was the right to think, the right to express thoughts in public (either by speaking or writing), the right to free commerce, and the right to personal freedom. Beyond that, his solution was self-government. Members of a society must elect and control public officials.

For Jefferson, people were born with *inalienable* rights, among which were "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." In his magnificent Declaration of Independence, he wrote "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are
endowed by their Creator with inherent and inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness...." Congress changed the wording to "certain unalienable rights." Jefferson's point in coining the term "inalienable" was that these rights were inherently part of the human condition and that while a government might deny these rights it could not abolish them.

Jefferson continued that governments were instituted to protect these rights and that they derived power to do so from the consent of the governed. If a government became destructive to these ends, it was "the right of the people to alter or abolish it."

To those who argued that men were incapable of governing themselves, Jefferson replied that if men could not be trusted to govern themselves, they certainly could not be trusted to govern others. Placing his confidence in the "common sense of mankind," Jefferson conceded that men who ruled themselves would make mistakes; but they would have a chance to correct them.

The key to a successful democracy, according to Jefferson, was popular education. He believed that ignorance was a tool of tyranny, and he therefore favored universal education. If democracy required citizens who could read, it made sense that they had to be free to read whatever they wanted. "Our liberty," said Jefferson, "depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost." If an idea were false, Jefferson believed that it should be disproved, "but, for God's sake, let us freely hear both sides."

All of this implied a radical freedom of conscience. Jefferson considered religious tyranny worse than political tyranny. Religion, he believed, was "a matter between every man and his maker, in which no other, and far less the public, has a right to intermeddle." This provided the basis for Jefferson's advocacy of the separation of church and state. "It does me no injury," he said, "for my neighbor to say there are twenty gods, or no god. It neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg."

Jefferson's application of these principles often fell short of his own ideals. He did not support universal suffrage or women's rights, and, of course, he owned slaves. In spite of his opposition to the Alien and Sedition Acts, he believed that the state governments could ban seditious libel.

As a theorist, Jefferson was exceedingly complex. As a politician, he proved flexible and less dogmatic than one might imagine. Above all, he articulated a vision of a free and democratic society. In doing so, he established goals to which his country might aspire.

When Jefferson took office, the Republicans detested the judiciary. Not a single Republican judge had been appointed to the federal judiciary in the 1790s, and Republican editors had been hauled before federal courts under the Sedition Act. Republicans repealed the Federal Judiciary Act of 1801 and removed John Pickering; some of the more extreme Republicans attempted to remove Justice Samuel Chase. John Marshall, a Federalist chief justice, deflected much of the hostility directed at the Supreme Court and laid the foundation for the Court's eventual independence. Just as important, he established the principle of judicial review and the supremacy of the national government over the states.

Among the tactics Marshall used was the device of having one justice's opinion (often his own) speak for the decision of the Court.

As the text points out, Marshall avoided a difficult situation in *Marbury v. Madison* while asserting the Court's role of constitutional oversight. The right of judicial review was not explicitly mentioned in the Constitution, although Hamilton asserted it in *The Federalist* No. 78. Marshall made his claim cautiously and tentatively. In doing so, he deflected possible opposition while establishing an important precedent.

In a series of cases, the United States Supreme Court established the right to review and reverse state court decisions that conflicted with federal law or the Constitution. Perhaps the best known of these was *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*. Lord Fairfax, who owned substantial land in Virginia, was a Loyalist and fled to England during the Revolution. He died in 1781 and bequeathed his holdings in Virginia to his nephew, Denny Fairfax, a British subject. Virginia passed an act in 1782 voiding the original grant based on the contention that, under Virginia law, aliens could not inherit property. In addition, various confiscation measures enacted, but never implemented, during the war transferred Lord Fairfax's property to the state. David Hunter obtained a grant of a portion of the Fairfax land from Virginia and brought an act of ejectment against the Fairfax interests. The Supreme Court of Virginia decided for Hunter. The United States Supreme Court reversed the Virginia court in 1813. In response, Virginia's judges claimed that, although bound by the Constitution and federal laws, they were not bound by the Supreme Court's interpretation of them. They therefore refused to obey the United States Supreme Court's order requiring them to enter judgment for the Fairfax interests. This brought the case back to the Supreme Court. Justice Joseph Story's opinion, the second document, powerfully asserted the supremacy of federal law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Finally, in *Fletcher v. Peck*, the Marshall Court overturned state actions that came into conflict with the Constitution.


**Questions for Discussion**

1. Is the power of judicial review provided for in the Constitution?

2. How does judicial review fit into the system of checks and balances?

3. Might Republicans have been especially upset at this exercise of judicial power because the Supreme Court had not declared the Alien and Sedition Acts unconstitutional?

4. The Marshall Court never again declared an act of Congress invalid. Why might it have been reluctant to do so?

5. The Supreme Court had issued writs of error to state courts for years before *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*. Why did this case arouse such a storm of controversy?

6. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., believed that the most significant power of the Supreme Court lay, not in its power to review federal legislation, but in its authority to review decisions of state courts. In other words, *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee* was more important than *Marbury v. Madison*. Do you agree?
Chief Justice Marshall delivered the opinion of the Court.

In the order in which the court has viewed this subject, the following questions have been considered and decided: 1st. Has the applicant a right to the commission he demands? 2d. If he has a right, and that right has been violated, do the laws of this country afford him a remedy? 3d. If they do afford him a remedy, is it a mandamus issuing from this court?

It is...the opinion of the Court: 1st. That by signing the commission of Mr. Marbury, the President of the United States appointed him a justice of the peace for the county of Washington, in the district of Columbia; and that the seal of the United States, affixed thereto by the secretary of state, is conclusive testimony of the verity of the signature, and of the completion of the appointment; and that the appointment conferred on him a legal right to the office for the space of five years. 2d. That, having this legal title to the office, he has a consequent right to the commission; a refusal to deliver which is a plain violation of that right, for which the laws of his country afford him a remedy.

3. It remains to be inquired whether he is entitled to the remedy for which he applies?

This...is a plain case for a mandamus, either to deliver the commission, or a copy of it from the record; and it only remains to be inquired, whether it can issue from this court?

The act to establish the judicial courts of the United States authorizes the supreme court, "to issue writs of mandamus, in cases warranted by the principles and usages of law, to any courts appointed or persons holding office, under the authority of the United States." The secretary of state, being a person holding an office under the authority of the United States, is precisely within the letter of this description; and if this court is not authorized to issue a writ of mandamus to such an officer, it must be because the law is unconstitutional...

The Constitution vests the whole judicial power of the United States in one Supreme Court, and such inferior courts as Congress shall, from time to time, ordain and establish....

In the distribution of this power, it is declared that "the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction in all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be a party. In all other cases, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction."...

If it had been intended to leave it in the discretion of the legislature to apportion the judicial power between the supreme and inferior courts according to the will of that body, it would certainly have been useless to have proceeded further than to have defined the judicial power, and the tribunals in which it should be vested. The subsequent part of the section is mere surplusage, is entirely without meaning,...

It cannot be presumed that any clause in the Constitution is intended to be without effect...

To enable this court, then, to issue a mandamus, it must be shown to be an exercise of appellate jurisdiction...

The authority, therefore, given to the Supreme Court, by the Act establishing the judicial courts of the United States, to issue writs of mandamus to public officers, appears not to be warranted by the Constitution...
CHAPTER 7

National Growing Pains

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

*Madison in Power*. In spite of the hostility to the embargo, the Republicans won both houses of Congress in the election of 1808, and James Madison won the presidency. The Non-Intercourse Act not only proved difficult to enforce, but it failed to prevent the British from continuing to seize American ships. Macon's Bill No. 2 removed all restrictions on trade with Britain and France, although British and French warships were still barred from American waters. It further authorized the president to reapply the principle of non-intercourse to either belligerent if the other ceased violations of neutral rights. When Napoleon announced he would revoke his restrictions if Britain agreed to abandon its own restrictive policies, Madison reapplied the non-intercourse policy to Britain. Meanwhile, France continued to seize American ships. Britain refused to modify the Orders in Council until the French actually lifted theirs. Madison refused to admit that he had been deceived by Napoleon and concluded that, unless Britain ended its restrictions, the United States must declare war.

*Tecumseh and Indian Resistance*. Growing numbers of American settlers steadily drove the Indians out of the Ohio Valley. Tecumseh, a Shawnee chief, attempted to unite all tribes east of the Mississippi into a great confederation. His brother, the Prophet, added the force of a moral crusade; he argued that Indians must give up white ways and preserve their Indian culture. In 1811, a military force led by General William Henry Harrison engaged the Indians at the Battle of Tippecanoe and destroyed the hopes of Tecumseh's federation.

*Depression and Land Hunger*. Some westerners attributed the low prices they received for agricultural goods to the loss of foreign markets and to British depredations against American shipping. American commercial restrictions and an inadequate transportation system actually contributed more significantly to the agricultural depression. Western expansionism fed war fever; westerners wanted Canada and Florida. The United States took the western part of Florida without opposition from Spain. In addition, Madison probably regarded an attack on Canada as a means to force Britain to respect neutral rights. The War Hawks, who came primarily from the west, wanted war against Britain primarily to defend America's national honor and to force a change in British policy.

*Opponents of War*. Maritime interests in the east feared a war against Britain, a nation with the most powerful navy in the world. However, Britain represented no real threat, and there were many strong cultural ties between the two countries. On the other hand, Napoleon posed a genuine and serious threat to the United States, and going to war with Britain would aid Napoleon. Moreover, by 1812 conditions in England made a change in British maritime policy likely. The growing effectiveness of Napoleon's Continental System caused a depression in Britain; and British manufacturers, who blamed hard times on the loss of American markets, urged the repeal of the Orders in Council. Gradually, the British
Justice Story delivered the opinion of the Court.

...But it is plain that the framers of the constitution did contemplate that cases within the judicial cognizance of the United States not only might but would arise in the state courts, in the exercise of their ordinary jurisdiction. With this view the sixth article declares, that "this constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the constitution, or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." It is obvious that this obligation is imperative upon the state judges in their official, and not merely in their private, capacities. From the very nature of their judicial duties they would be called upon to pronounce the law applicable to the case in judgment. They were not to decide merely according to the laws or constitution of the State, but according to the constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States, "the supreme law of the land."

It must, therefore, be conceded that the constitution not only contemplated, but meant to provide for cases within the scope of the judicial power of the United States, which might yet depend before state tribunals. It was foreseen that in the exercise of their ordinary jurisdiction, state courts would incidentally take cognizance of cases arising under the constitution, the laws, and treaties of the United States. Yet to all these cases the judicial power, by the very terms of the constitution, is to extend. It cannot extend by original jurisdiction if that was already rightfully and exclusively attached in the state courts, which (as has been already shown) may occur; it must therefore extend by appellate jurisdiction, or not at all. It would seem to follow that the appellate powers of the United States must, in such cases, extend to state tribunals; and if in such cases, there is no reason why it should not equally attach upon all others within the purview of the constitution....

On the whole, the courts are of the opinion, that the appellate power of the United States does extend to cases pending in the state courts...
government moved to suspend the Orders, but not until Congress had declared war on Great Britain in 1812.

The War of 1812. The War of 1812 was poorly planned and managed. Despite a few successes at sea, the U.S. Navy could not effectively challenge Britain's mastery of the Atlantic. Canada appeared to be Britain's weak spot, but an American invasion failed because of poor leadership and the unwillingness of some American militiamen to leave their own soil. Soon Americans were fighting to keep the British from taking American territory. Captain Oliver Hazard Perry defeated the British fleet and gained control of Lake Erie. This made British control of Detroit untenable, and when they fell back, Harrison defeated the British at Thames River. Another attempt to capture Canada failed, however, and the British captured Fort Niagara and burned Buffalo.

Britain Assumes the Offensive. The war against Napoleon occupied the British until 1814. After Napoleon's defeat, the British put more effort into the war with America. The British undertook a three-pronged attack, but they were scarcely more effective than the Americans when they assumed the offensive. The central British force did take Washington and burn most public buildings; however, the attack on Washington constituted the only British success. When they moved up the Chesapeake, American forces stopped them at Baltimore.

"The Star Spangled Banner." An American civilian, Francis Scott Key, observed the bombardment of Fort McHenry from the deck of a British ship, where he was being held prisoner. When he saw the American flag still flying over the fort the next morning, he dashed off the words to the "Star-Spangled Banner," which was later set to music and eventually became the national anthem. The burning of Washington shocked many Americans, and thousands came forward to enlist. The British advance from the north was checked by a much smaller force of Americans at Plattsburg.

The Treaty of Ghent. In 1814, the British and Americans met at Ghent to discuss terms for peace. The British prolonged negotiations in the hope that their offensive would give them the upper hand. News of the British defeat at Plattsburg, however, forced the British to modify their demands. They eventually agreed to American demands for the status quo ante bellum. Negotiators signed the Treaty of Ghent on December 24, 1814.

The Hartford Convention. News of the treaty had not yet reached America when a group of New England Federalists met to protest the war and plan for a convention to revise the Constitution. Their opposition to the war had made them unpopular in the rest of the country, which in turn encouraged extremists in New England to talk of secession. However, moderate Federalists controlled the Hartford Convention. Their resolutions argued that states had a right to interpose their authority to protect themselves from violations of the Constitution. They also proposed a series of amendments to the Constitution. News of the Treaty of Ghent discredited Federalists, who had predicted a British victory.
**The Battle of New Orleans.** News of the Treaty of Ghent failed to arrive in time to prevent the Battle of New Orleans. The British attack on New Orleans was part of their three-prong offensive. Americans, commanded by General Andrew Jackson, successfully withstood the British assault and inflicted heavy casualties on the British while suffering only minor losses themselves.

**Victory Weakens the Federalists.** America's ability to hold off the British in the War of 1812 convinced European powers that the United States and its republican form of government were there to stay. The war cost the United States relatively few casualties and little economic loss (except for shipping interests). Among the big losers were Native Americans. The war also completed the destruction of the Federalist party. As Europe settled down to what would be a century of relative peace, major foreign threats to the United States ended. Commerce revived, and European immigration to America resumed.

**Anglo-American Rapprochement.** After the War of 1812, Britain and the United States negotiated peaceful solutions to several old problems. American trade had become more important to the British economy, and in 1815 the two countries signed a commercial agreement ending discriminatory duties and making other adjustments favorable to trade. In 1817, in the Rush-Bagot Agreement, the two countries agreed to demilitarize the Great Lakes. The following year, a joint Anglo-American commission settled the disputed boundary between the United States and Canada by designating the 49th parallel as the northern boundary of the Louisiana Territory from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains. They also agreed to the joint control of the Oregon country for ten years.

**The Transcontinental Treaty.** Jackson's pursuit of Indians into Spanish Florida and his capture of two Spanish forts raised Spanish fears that America would eventually seize all of Florida. Spain was even more concerned about the security of its holdings in northern Mexico and was ready to give up Florida in exchange for an agreement protecting its Mexican empire. However, in the Transcontinental Treaty of 1819, Spain had to accept a boundary to the Louisiana Territory that followed the Sabine, Red, and Arkansas rivers to the Continental Divide and the 42nd parallel to the Pacific. The United States obtained Florida for $5 million, to be paid to Americans with claims against Spain.

**The Monroe Doctrine.** Fears of Russian expansion in the Western Hemisphere prompted Monroe and his secretary of state, John Quincy Adams, to warn: "The American continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial establishments." Russia agreed to abandon territorial claims south of 54 degrees, 40 minutes and to remove restrictions on foreign shipping. A greater threat came when several European powers decided to try to restore Spain's empire. Neither the British nor the Americans wanted to see a restoration of the Spanish empire. Britain, however, had no desire to recognize the new revolutionary republics in South America, in spite of a growing trade with these countries. America had already recognized them. Monroe rejected a British proposal for a joint declaration and included a statement of American policy in his message to Congress in 1823. The United States would not interfere with existing European colonies in North or South America and would avoid involvement in European affairs. However, any attempt to extend European
control to countries that had won their independence would be considered hostile to the United States. The Monroe Doctrine may be seen as the final stage of American independence.

**The Era of Good Feelings.** The political factionalism of earlier days diminished during Monroe's presidency, which came to be known as the "Era of Good Feelings." The country was at peace and prosperous. It has been said that the harmony of the era was largely superficial. However, the people of the period had good reasons for believing that their era was harmonious. Jeffersonians had come to accept most of Hamilton's economic policies. The Jeffersonian balance between individual liberty and responsible government had survived both bad management and war; in doing so, it established its legitimacy even to the opposition. When political divisions reappeared, they did not grow out of old controversies. Rather, new issues emerged out of the growth of the country.

**New Sectional Issues.** The War of 1812 and the depression that struck the country in 1819 shaped many of the controversies of the Era of Good Feelings. The panic of 1819 strengthened the position of protectionists, who argued that American industry needed protection from foreign competition. The protectionists included small manufacturers, unemployed workers, and farmers (who depended on the workers as consumers of agricultural products). With the exception of shipping interests, the north favored protectionism. The South initially favored protectionism as a means to foster national economic self-sufficiency. Eventually, however, the South rejected protectionism on the ground that tariffs increased the price of imports and hampered the export of cotton and tobacco.

The charter of the First Bank of the United States was not renewed when it expired in 1811, mainly because of opposition from state banks. Many new state banks were created after 1811, and most recklessly overextended credit. After the British raid on Washington created a panic, all banks outside New England suspended specie payments. A second Bank of the United States was established in 1816, but, unlike the first Bank, it was poorly managed and irresponsibly created credit. The depression of 1819 hit the Bank as hard as it hit many state banks. In response, the Bank pursued a policy of strict curtailment in order to restore its financial standing. As a result, the Bank reached a new low in public favor. Regional divisions were less distinct on the Bank issue than on the tariff.

Easy credit policies of the banks led to a boom in land sales. However, agricultural expansion in America and the resumption of agricultural production in Europe after the Napoleonic Wars resulted in falling prices. As prices fell, many western debtors faced ruin. Westerners wanted cheap land, while the North and South regarded the public domain as a national asset to be converted into as much money as possible. Northern manufacturers also worried that cheap western land would draw off surplus labor from the east and force up wages. Southern planters feared competition from southwestern cotton.

Although slavery became the most divisive sectional issue, it caused remarkably little conflict in national politics before 1819. Congress abolished the African slave trade in 1808 with little controversy. New free and slave states were added to the Union in equal numbers, thus maintaining the balance in the Senate. The cotton boom led southerners to defend the institution more aggressively, which irritated many northerners, but most people regarded
slavery as a local issue. The West tended to support the South's position. Southwestern slave states naturally supported slavery; in addition, the northwest was also sympathetic, partly because it sold much of its produce to southern plantations and partly because many settlers in the area came from slave states.

**Northern Leaders.** New leaders emerged after the War of 1812 to replace the Revolutionary generation. John Quincy Adams emerged as the best-known northern leader of the early 1820s. Adams began his career as a Federalist but became a Republican. An ardent nationalist, he supported the Louisiana Purchase and internal improvements. Like most New Englanders, he opposed slavery. Daniel Webster, although basically a nationalist, reflected the interests of his native New England. He opposed the Embargo Act, the War of 1812, the high tariff of 1816, cheap land, internal improvements, and he initially opposed the Second Bank (largely on partisan grounds). A professional politician, Martin Van Buren avoided taking positions if he could avoid it. He expressed no clear opinions on such major issues as slavery or the tariff.

**Southern Leaders.** The most prominent southern leader, William H. Crawford of Georgia, served in the Senate and as Monroe's secretary of the treasury. He understood the use of patronage and was one of the first politicians to try to build a national machine. The other outstanding southern leader, John C. Calhoun of South Carolina, took a strong nationalist position on all issues of the day. Although devoted to the South and its institutions, he took a broad view of political affairs.

**Western Leaders.** Henry Clay of Kentucky was the most prominent western leader. Clay's "American System" reflected his gift for seeing national needs from a broad perspective. He advocated federal support for internal improvements and a protective tariff. Although himself a slave owner, he opposed slavery on principle and favored colonization. Thomas Hart Benton championed the small western farmer. William Henry Harrison made his reputation as a soldier before entering politics. He had little impact on the developing political alignments of the 1820s. Andrew Jackson resembled Harrison in many ways; although his popularity far exceeded Harrison's. His chief assets were his reputation as a military hero and his forceful personality. No one knew his views on important issues, but this did not stop enthusiastic supporters from backing him for president.

**The Missouri Compromise.** Missouri's request for admission as a slave state touched off a serious political controversy. In voting that split along sectional lines, the House added the Tallmadge Amendment to the Missouri Enabling Act. The Tallmadge Amendment prohibited the further introduction of slavery into Missouri and provided that all slaves born in Missouri after statehood should be freed at age twenty-five. The Senate defeated the amendment. The debate did not turn on the morality of slavery. Northerners objected to adding new slave states because these states would be over represented in Congress under the Three-fifths Compromise. Since the debate concerned political influence rather than the morality of slavery, the situation lent itself to compromise. Missouri entered as a slave state, and its admission was balanced by the admission of Maine as a free state. To prevent further conflict, Congress adopted a proposal to prohibit slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of 36 degrees, 30 minutes.
The Election of 1824. Politics continued to divide along sectional lines, although no issue divided the country so deeply as slavery. Politicians who aspired to the presidency could not afford to alienate any section by taking extreme positions on divisive issues. By 1824, the old party system had broken down. The Federalists had disappeared as a national party, and factional disputes plagued the Jeffersonians. No candidate won a majority of the electoral college in a bitter contest that attracted little public interest. In the House of Representatives, Clay threw his support to John Quincy Adams, who became the next president.

J.Q. Adams as President. Adams took a Hamiltonian view and sought to promote projects beneficial to the national interest. He proposed a vast program of internal improvements as well as aid to manufacturing and agriculture. A Jeffersonian nationalist would have had difficulty gaining acceptance of these proposals; with his Federalist background, Adams had no chance. Adams's inability to garner popular support and his refusal to use the power of appointments to win political support further impeded his administration.

Calhoun's "Exposition and Protest." A new tariff in 1828 set high duties on manufactured goods and agricultural products. Calhoun believed that the tariff would impoverish the South. In response, he wrote the "South Carolina Exposition and Protest," an essay repudiating the nationalist philosophy he had previously espoused and defending the right of a state to nullify an act of Congress.

The Meaning of Sectionalism. The sectional issues that strained the ties between people of different regions were products of powerful forces, such as growth and prosperity, that actually bound the sections together. Other forces unifying the nation were patriotism and commitment to the American experiment in government.
POUNTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The reasons for anti-British feelings on the frontier.
2. Why some people, particularly in New England, opposed the War of 1812.
3. Why the British were not more successful in fighting the War of 1812.
4. Why the war signaled the death knell of Federalism.
5. The reasons for the Anglo-American rapprochement after the War of 1812.
6. Why the United States was able to negotiate such favorable terms in the Transcontinental Treaty.
7. The origins of the Monroe Doctrine and the reasons for its acceptance.
8. Why the text refers to the War of 1812 as "the final stage in the evolution of American independence."
9. Why Monroe's presidency became known as the "Era of Good Feelings."
10. How the country divided over the tariff.
12. The sectional divisions over land policy in the West.
13. The emergence of sectional leaders.
14. The issues leading to the Missouri Compromise.
15. The political divisions within the Republican party.
16. Why the South differed from the rest of the nation on the issue of the tariff.
17. The reasoning behind Calhoun's theory of nullification.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. What impact did European affairs have on the United States in the first two decades of the nineteenth century?

2. On a number of issues, Federalists and Republicans seemed to reverse their positions in the early nineteenth century. What might have caused these reversals?

3. Did the War of 1812 settle anything?

4. Was the "Era of Good Feelings" a misnomer?

5. Why were the issues that divided the country in 1820 compromised with such relative ease? What issues were left unsettled?

5. Without an opposition party, factions developed within the Republican party. Did this make the resolution of political differences more or less likely? Why?

6. Using the "Mapping the Past" section and other relevant sections of the text, discuss the role of the tariff in the emerging sectional conflict. How did slavery play into the controversy over the tariff?

7. How significant is the distinction some historians draw between a “frontier” and the “middle ground”?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENTS

Tecumseh and the Prophet

The text discusses Tecumseh's attempt to unite the tribes of the Ohio Valley in opposition to white encroachment. Historians have disagreed in their understanding of Tecumseh and his brother, Tenskwatawa. Moreover, white attitudes were never monolithic and often complex, as the text suggests. These themes are worth developing.

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century, political leaders in Washington held different attitudes toward Indians from their countrymen who lived on the frontier. The Founding Fathers considered Indians lesser beings; at the same time, as good Enlightenment thinkers influenced by Rousseau, they were inclined to regard Indians as "noble savages." Many believed that the Indians could be converted into small farmers and assimilated into American society. Moreover, most Indians had been forced from the eastern seaboard, and they no longer posed a threat there.

Frontiersmen, however, demonstrated less willingness to assimilate the Indians. Many frontiersmen went west in pursuit of economic opportunity, and they regarded Indians as impediments in their search for riches. Federal officials might distinguish between white
and Indian lands, but westerners did not.

Indian policy reflected these disagreements. Federal officials signed seventeen treaties with the tribes of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan between 1795 and 1809. American settlers regularly disregarded the terms of these treaties.

The advance of white settlers not only encroached on the homeland of the Indian inhabitants of the area, but also depleted the game. Offenses against Indians often went unpunished because white juries would not convict whites accused of crimes against Indians.

Inevitably, the tribes struck back. American settlers refused to admit their own responsibility and blamed the British for inciting the Indians. The British did attempt to manipulate and capitalize on Indian resentment, but the Indians did not need to be "stirred up." They had their own reasons for opposing American settlement and were usually more militant than the British.

Historians have traditionally admired Tecumseh, much as the text does. They have found much to praise in his efforts to create a political and military structure to defend Indian lands. At the same time, historians have usually portrayed Tenskwatawa as something of a charlatan. David Edmunds has pointed out, however, that in times of trouble, Indians have historically turned to religious leaders or revitalization movements. He cites Neolin, a Delaware prophet of the time of Pontiac's rebellion; Handsome Lake of the Senecas (a contemporary of Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa, whose teachings were remarkably similar to the Prophet's); and Wovoka of the Paiute.

Edmunds argues that Tenskwatawa played a more instrumental role than Tecumseh in forging the Indian coalition. Between 1805 and 1809, the religious teachings of the Prophet attracted thousands of Indians. Prior to 1808, white documents do not mention Tecumseh, and they first refer to him as "the Prophet's brother." Numerous references to the Prophet and his movement appear before that first mention of Tecumseh. According to Edmunds, the Shawnee chief used his brother's religious movement as the base for his political and military confederacy, and Tecumseh did not come into ascendancy until after the destruction of Prophetstown.

Edmunds speculates that white historians have focused on Tecumseh as the leader of the movement since his approach (military and political union) was more logical by white standards than that of his brother. Yet the fact remains that the Prophet had greater appeal for Indians. Edmunds further asserts that the emphasis on Tecumseh reflects the persistence of white ideas about the "noble savage."

Edmunds raises some significant issues: the need for understanding Indian history from an Indian perspective, how historians understand the past, and the persistence of cultural and racial stereotypes. Perhaps, however, Tecumseh's appropriation of white methods did indeed offer the best hope of successful resistance. In any case, Edmunds forces us to reexamine the way historians have traditionally understood one of the most determined episodes of Indian resistance.

The Missouri Compromise

The Missouri crisis in Congress emerged like a grim summer storm, quickly and without warning, and, like a summer storm, it passed quickly. Underlying the congressional debate, however, were emerging sectional divisions that would do much to shape the rest of the nineteenth century in America.

The most prominent feature of the voting on the Tallmadge Amendment was its sectional character. Clear lines were drawn between a slaveholding South and a free-state North. Moreover, despite an infusion of southern immigrants into the northwestern states, these states tilted toward the North and East as the debates progressed. This marked the beginning of "the North" as a political entity.

The debates marked another change as well. In past debates over slavery, southerners had not defended slavery per se. They had argued over the power of Congress to interfere with domestic arrangements within the states. In the Missouri debates, however, Senator William Smith of South Carolina passionately defended the institution itself. Smith urged his fellow senators to consult Leviticus and concluded, "Mr. President, the Scriptures teach us that slavery was universally indulged among the holy fathers." Even Smith's fellow South Carolinians considered Smith's comments extreme, and South Carolina itself was an exceptional case. Smith's remarks were important, however, if for no other reason than they anticipated the day when many southerners would defend slavery by appealing to the Bible and the laws of God.

In the House, Charles Pinckney of South Carolina responded to James W. Taylor's attack on slavery with a passionate defense of the institution: "Every slave has a comfortable house, is well fed, clothed, and taken care of; he has his family about him, and in sickness has the same medical aid as his master, and has a sure and comfortable retreat in old age....During his whole life he is free from care, that canker of the human heart." Pinckney noted that in the Old Testament Abraham owned slaves, and the South Carolinian argued that any attempt to restrict slavery threatened the economic structure of both the South and the whole nation.

Ultimately, both sides agreed to compromise. The Missouri Compromise reflected, among other things, the enormous shift from a colonial economy to a national and internal one. The Northwest produced largely for a southern market, as the South moved toward a one-crop system dependent on cotton. At the same time, however, the price and acreage of cotton could not have justified a split from the Union. Moreover, any such split would have thrown the southern economy on the none-too-tender mercy of the Liverpool market. Thus, in 1820, economy and geography demanded a reconciliation of differences. Only a deep commitment to the abolition of slavery or to black rights could have pushed the North to maintain a hard line, and the North was committed to neither. Thus, sectional differences were compromised.

In the future, however, these mitigating factors would not necessarily pertain. Jefferson recognized this when he wrote that sectional antagonism had been "hushed, indeed, for the moment. But this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper."
INTRODUCTION

Like his father, John Quincy Adams was a man of virtue and talent who conspicuously lacked any gift for winning popular support. The younger Adams supported the Federalists in the battles of the 1790s. In the new century, however, he rejected the bitter-end Federalism of New England and made a career as a diplomat under Republican administrations. He supported the Louisiana Purchase as well as Jefferson's embargo and served as a negotiator at Ghent. He objected strongly to the extreme Federalist opposition to the War of 1812. The first document, Adams's "Reply to the Appeal of the Massachusetts Federalists," attacked the motives and purposes of those who drafted the Hartford Convention.

As the text notes, Adams and Clay were the two candidates most closely associated with a program of tariffs, internal improvements, and national banking in 1824. Adams's inaugural address stressed the common principles shared by all Americans during the Era of Good Feelings. His first annual message to Congress reflected his commitment to nationalism and to internal improvements. In it, he requested a program of federal improvements that went beyond what even Clay proposed.


QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. What might have caused John Quincy Adams to abandon his father's party and make his peace with the Republicans?

2. What, according to Adams, is the real intention of the Hartford Convention?

3. What does Adams have to say about the Federalists in his Inaugural Address?

4. How do the proposals in Adams's First Annual Message relate to Hamilton's plan? Did Adams abandon his Federalist principles or not?

5. Why was it politically disastrous for Adams, the son of John Adams and a former Federalist himself, to introduce his plans for internal improvements?
The [Hartford] Convention represented the extreme portion of the Federalism of New England—the party spirit of the school of Alexander Hamilton combined with the sectional Yankee spirit....

This coalition of Hamiltonian Federalism with the Yankee spirit had produced as incongruous and absurd a system of politics as ever was exhibited in the vagaries of the human mind. It was compounded of the following prejudices: —

1. An utter detestation of the French Revolution and of France, and a corresponding excess of attachment to Great Britain, as the only barrier against the universal, dreaded empire of France.

2. A strong aversion to republics and republican government, with a profound impression that our experiment of a confederated republic had failed for want of virtue in the people.

3. A deep jealousy of the Southern and Western states, and a strong disgust at the effect of the slave representation in the Constitution of the United States.

4. A belief that Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison were servilely devoted to France, and under French influence.

Every one of these sentiments weakened the attachments of those who held them to the Union, and consequently their patriotism....

These were the opinions, aggravated by the pressure of the embargo, and afterwards of the war, represented by the Hartford Convention...

It will be no longer necessary to search for the objects of the Hartford Convention. They are apparent from the whole tenor of their report and resolutions, compared with the journal of their proceedings. They are admitted in the first and last paragraphs of the report, and they were:

To wait for the issue of the negotiation at Ghent.
In the event of the continuance of the war, to take one more chance of getting into their own hands the administration of the general government.
On the failure of that, a secession from the Union and a New England confederacy.

To these ends, and not to the defense of this part of the country against the foreign enemy, all the measures of the Hartford Convention were adapted; and, of these ends, that of ripening the sentiment of a necessity for the last of these measures was the greatest object of the solicitude of the Convention, and the consummation of all their labors....
John Quincy Adams, Inaugural Address (1825)

It is a source of gratification and of encouragement to me to observe that the great result of this experiment upon the theory of human rights has at the close of that generation by which it was formed been crowned with success equal to the most sanguine expectations of its founders....Of the two great political parties which have divided the opinions and feelings of our country, the candid and the just will now admit that both have contributed splendid talents, spotless integrity, ardent patriotism, and disinterested sacrifices to the formation and administration of this Government, and that both have required a liberal indulgence for a portion of human infirmity and error....With the catastrophe in which the wars of the French Revolution terminated, and our own subsequent peace with Great Britain, this baneful weed of party strife was uprooted. From that time no difference of principle, connected either with the theory of government or with our intercourse with foreign nations, has existed or been called forth in force sufficient to sustain a continued combination of parties to give more than wholesome animation to public sentiment or legislative debate....There still remains one effort of magnanimity, one sacrifice of prejudice and passion, to be made by the individuals throughout the nation who have heretofore followed the standards of political party. It is that of discarding every remnant of rancor against each other, of embracing as our countrymen and friends, and of yielding to talents and virtue alone that confidence which in times of contention for principle was bestowed only upon those who bore the badge of party communion....
John Quincy Adams, First Annual Message (1825)

...Upon this first occasion of addressing the Legislature of the Union, with which I have been honored, in presenting to their view the execution so far as it has been effected of the measures sanctioned by them for promoting the internal improvement of our country, I can not close the communication without recommending to their calm and persevering consideration the general principle in a more enlarged extent. The great object of the institution of civil government is the improvement of the condition of those who are parties to the social compact, and no government, in whatever form constituted, can accomplish the lawful ends of its institution but in proportion as it improves the condition of those over whom it is established. Roads and canals, by multiplying and facilitating the communications and intercourse between distant regions and multitudes of men, are among the most important means of improvement. But moral, political, intellectual improvement are duties assigned by the Author of Our Existence to social no less than to individual man. For the fulfillment of those duties governments are invested with power, and to the attainment of the end—the progressive improvement of the condition of the governed—the exercise of delegated powers is a duty as sacred and indispensable as the usurpation of powers not granted is criminal and odious. Among the first, perhaps the very first, instrument for the improvement of the condition of men is knowledge, and to the acquisition of much of the knowledge adapted to the wants, the comforts, and enjoyments of human life public institutions and seminaries of learning are essential. So convinced of this was the first of my predecessors in this office...that once and again in his addresses to the Congress...he earnestly recommended the establishment of...a national university and a military academy....

...I would suggest the expediency of connecting the equipment of a public ship for the exploration of the whole northwest coast of this continent.

The establishment of an uniform standard of weights and measures was one of the specific objects contemplated in the formation of our Constitution, and to fix that standard was one of the powers delegated by express terms in that instrument to Congress....

Connected with the establishment of an university, or separate from it, might be undertaken the erection of an astronomical observatory, with provision for the support of an astronomer...
CHAPTER 8
Toward a National Economy

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Gentility and the Consumer Revolution. Although the country remained primarily agricultural, new attitudes toward material goods and new ways of producing them brought a major economic readjustment. The industrial revolution would change America. Ironically, widespread emulation of aristocratic behavior followed in the wake of America's democratic revolution. In Europe, gentility was the product of ancestry and cultivated style; in America, possession of material goods largely defined gentility. Americans were demanding more goods than traditional craftsmen could produce. Therefore, producers sought to expand their workshops, train more artisans, lay in large stocks of materials, and acquire labor-saving machines. These developments constituted the market revolution of the early nineteenth century. The industrial revolution came on its heels.

Birth of the Factory. Britain began mechanizing in the 1770s, bringing workers together in buildings called factories and using power from water and later steam. By comparison, such changes came late to America. America depended on Britain for manufactured goods until the Revolution. The first American factory began production in 1790. Not long after, the Boston Associates, a group of merchants headed by Francis Cabot Lowell, established the Boston Manufacturing Company at Waltham. Lowell revolutionized textile production. His operation combined machine production, large-scale operation, efficient management, and centralized marketing.

An Industrial Proletariat? The changing structure of work widened the gap between owners and workers and blurred the distinctions between skilled and unskilled workers. As the importance of skilled labor declined, so did the ability of workers to influence working conditions. Despite these changes, America did not develop a self-conscious working class. Some historians argue that the frontier siphoned off displaced or dissatisfied workers. Others believe that ethnic and racial differences prevented the formation of a distinct working class with common needs. Still others contend that the influx of immigrants willing to accept low wages undercut attempts to organize workers. Finally, America's expanding economy provided opportunities for workers to rise out of the working-class and therefore prevented the formation of strong working class identities. Moreover, conditions in early shops and factories represented an improvement for the people who worked in them. Most factory workers were drawn from outside the regular labor market; textile mills in particular relied on the employment of women and children.

Lowell's Waltham System: Women as Factory Workers. The Boston Associates developed the "Waltham System" of employing young, unmarried women in their new textile mills. Young women came from farms all over New England to work for a year or two in the mills; many did not need to support themselves and worked for other reasons. They lived in
strictly supervised company boardinghouses. Although many observers commented favorably on conditions in the mills, hours were long and women were kept out of supervisory positions. Discontent manifested itself in two strikes in the 1830s. Declining prices in the 1840s led owners to introduce new rules to increase production. By then, however, the sort of young women who had been drawn to the mills had begun to find work as schoolteachers and clerks. Mill owners turned to Irish immigrants to operate the machines.

Irish and German Immigrants. The population of the United States more than doubled in the period from 1790 to 1820. Remarkably, this growth resulted almost entirely from natural increase. After 1815, immigration began to pick up. Most immigrants came from Germany, Ireland, Britain, and Scandinavia. Immigrants were drawn by the prospect of abundant land, good wages, and economic opportunity. Others sought religious or political freedom. In the long run, immigration stimulated the American economy. In the short run, however, the influx of the 1830s and 1840s depressed living standards. Native-born workers resented immigrants for their willingness to accept low wages and, in the case of the Irish, for their Catholicism.

Persistence of the Household System. Technology affected American industry unevenly, and not all advances were immediately accepted. Yet in nearly every field, apparently minor changes had significant consequences. Improvements in the design of waterwheels made possible larger and more efficient machinery in mills and factories. Other developments led to greater efficiency in the production of iron, paper, glass, and pottery. Commercial canning of sterilized foods in airtight containers began about 1820.

Rise of Corporations. Mechanization required substantial capital investment, and the corporation provided a means to gather capital. In the early days of the nation, however, states chartered only a few corporations, and very few of these engaged in manufacturing. Most people believed that only quasi-public projects deserved the privilege of incorporation. Moreover, many people associated corporations with monopoly. During the War of 1812, considerable capital was transferred from commerce to industry. Manufacturing gave rise to more and larger cities, which, in turn, provided markets for farmers.

Cotton Revolutionizes the South. The South began to produce cotton to supply the textile factories of New England. However, high quality, long staple "sea island" cotton could be grown only in limited areas, and the lint of heartier "green seed," or upland, cotton could not easily be separated from the seed. Eli Whitney's invention of the cotton gin, which efficiently separated the lint from the seed of short staple cotton, led to an enormous expansion of cotton production. Demand kept the price high in spite of the increased production. Cotton stimulated the economy of the entire nation. Most of it was exported, which paid for European products. Northern merchants transported, insured, and traded in cotton.

Revival of Slavery. Slavery declined in the decade of the Revolution, but racial prejudice blunted the logic of the Revolution's libertarian beliefs. Moreover, the revolutionary generation had a great respect for property rights. Forced abolition therefore had few proponents. Moreover, the bloody uprising in Saint Domingue led many whites to reconsider ending slavery. The Revolution had led to the manumission of many slaves. As
the number of free blacks rose, tighter restrictions were imposed on them. Some opponents of slavery hoped to solve the "problem" of free blacks by establishing colonies of freed slaves (usually in Africa). The colonization movement did establish a settlement in Liberia; few American blacks, however, had any desire to migrate to an alien land. The cotton boom of the early nineteenth century virtually halted the colonization movement. The boom also gave rise to an interstate slave trade. In the northern states, blacks faced legal liabilities, denial of suffrage, and segregation or exclusion.

Roads to Market. Advances in transportation played a crucial role in the settlement of the West. Barges could bring goods downstream, but transportation upstream was prohibitive—thus the importance of roads linking the Mississippi Valley to the eastern seaboard.

Transportation and the Government. Most of the improved highways and bridges were built by private developers, who charged tolls for the use of their roads. Local, state, and national governments contributed heavily to internal improvements. The obvious need for roads linking the Trans-Appalachian west with the eastern seaboard called for action by the national government, but sectional rivalries in Congress prevented such action. Until the coming of railroads, overland shipping remained uneconomical, so inventors concentrated on improving water transport.

Development of Steamboats. Rafts and flatboats could move downstream only; the steamboat answered the problem of moving upstream. With the advent of the steamboat, freight charges plummeted, and the Northwest became part of the national market.

The Canal Boom. Canals further improved the network of transportation. Although canals cost more to build than roads, they remained more efficient for moving goods than overland transportation until the advent of the railroad. The Erie Canal linked Lake Erie with the Hudson River. It was an immediate financial success.

New York City: Emporium of the Western World. New York had already become the nation's largest city. The Erie Canal solidified its position as the national metropolis. Pennsylvania, desperate to keep up with New York, began constructing canals at a feverish pace. States beyond the mountains displayed an even greater zeal for the construction of canals. The zeal proved excessive; many states overextended themselves by building dozens of feeder lines. The result was frequently financial disaster.

The Marshall Court. Chief Justice John Marshall believed in a powerful central government. He also regarded the business community as an agent of progress. In a series of cases between 1819 and 1824, Marshall upheld the "sanctity" of contracts and the supremacy of the federal government. In *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, Marshall held that the contract clause of the Constitution prohibited New Hampshire from canceling or altering the charter granted to Dartmouth College by King George III in 1769 without the consent of both parties. In *McCulloch v. Maryland*, Marshall endorsed the constitutionality of the Second Bank of the United States and struck down attempts by states to tax it. The decision
adopted the Hamiltonian, or "loose," interpretation of the Constitution and strengthened the implied powers of Congress. *Gibbons v. Ogden* established federal supremacy by broadly construing the "commerce" clause. Under Marshall, the court established the principle of judicial review, thereby establishing the Court as a vital part of the American system of government.

Two years after Marshall died, the Court ruled on the *Charles River Bridge* case (1837). The state of Massachusetts built a bridge across the Charles River that drew traffic from an older, privately owned toll bridge. The state stopped collecting tolls after recovering the costs of building the bridge, and the owners of the older bridge sued, claiming that, by building the bridge, Massachusetts had rendered the stock in the company worthless (and thereby violated the contract clause of the Constitution). Speaking for the Court, the new chief justice, Roger Taney, held that the state had a right to place "the comfort and convenience" of the whole community above that of an individual company.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The factors leading to industrialization.
2. What slowed industrialization in the United States.
3. The elements of factory production.
4. Why the United States did not develop a class-conscious working class.
5. The factors that led to a resumption of immigration to the United States and the impact of that immigration.
6. The factors that led to the expansion of cotton cultivation in the South.
7. The reasons for the revitalization of slavery as an institution.
8. The impulse for the colonization of blacks and the different approaches of whites and blacks to colonization.
9. The importance of transportation to the West.
10. The role of the government in supporting economic development.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Before 1815, American economic development was linked to international trade. What factors led to decreased dependence on Europe and the emergence of a largely self-sustaining domestic market?

2. What impact might the development of factories have had on workers? How might it have changed their attitudes and their relationships with employers?

3. Discuss the ways in which changing patterns of work influenced the geography of cities such as Philadelphia (see the "Mapping the Past" section).

2. Consider the consequences of the market revolution (see the “Debating the Past” section) in the context of the discussion of artisan labor the Lecture Supplement.

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

Chapter 8 deals with the emergence of the factory system and the persistence of the household system. Related issues worth exploring include the emergence of a national market, the creation of a market economy, and the impact of these changes on workers.

One of the most profound alterations that accompanied the emergence of the factory system in the early years of the nineteenth century was the changing nature of labor. The term labor obviously encompassed many varieties of worker: free, semi-free, slave, male and female, urban and rural, skilled and unskilled. This essay will focus on one particular group—the artisans (urban, male, white, skilled craftsmen). It was on these workers that the rise of manufacturing had its greatest impact. From the artisans, the largest group of nonagricultural producers, came the most powerful critiques (and defenses) of the new economic order. These were neither unskilled proletarians nor modern factory hands. The term artisan comprised skilled wage earners and independent men alike. Their history did not involve a straightforward clash between capital and labor; rather, it involved the very making and discovery of class distinctions between employers and employees.

The basic structures of the artisan system of labor came to America from England. In cities and towns, craftsmen provided the wealthy as well as humbler folk with all varieties of handmade goods. Markets for the craftsmen were extremely limited, usually confined to the immediate surrounding area. Most of the work was custom made (so-called bespoke work) and required a fair degree of skill to complete. The small firm, with little capital and at most four journeymen, was typical.

At the base of the artisan system of labor were the apprentices. These boys worked for a master for a fixed period of time in exchange for food, lodging, and instruction in the trade. Once an apprentice served his time, he became a journeyman, a free laborer who earned wages from a master craftsman. Usually, the master owned the tools, the shop, and the raw materials. Journeymen fully expected to become masters themselves one day. At the top of the trade stood the masters, who ran the shops, obtained raw materials, and sold the finished
goods for profit. The mutual bonds of craft exerted an enormous influence and provided the ideological keystone of harmony in the trade.

With the American Revolution and the end of British mercantilist rule, American merchants suddenly found themselves capable of forging their own markets along the Atlantic seaboard and into the developing Old Northwest. The expansion of the cotton-producing slave South provided a potentially lucrative market. The rise of American merchant capitalism ushered in the American industrial (or, more properly, factory) age.

American entrepreneurs, particularly those in New York and Philadelphia, moved to gain control of supplies of raw materials and to extend their shipping and marketing contacts beyond their own cities. They began to sell large quantities of goods for slaves and transient sailors. In the process, they squeezed out many smaller master craftsmen and undermined the artisan system of labor.

In outlying areas near large cities or ports, particularly in New England, merchant capitalists centralized production and, by the 1840s, had already begun to erect large central shops and the first factories. In larger cities, however, high real estate costs and lack of ready sources of waterpower or coal precluded much centralization or the use of machines. The main resource in the cities was cheap labor. Merchants and some wealthy masters began to divide work into its various components. Skilled artisans continued to perform those tasks necessary to accommodate the bespoke trade, but masters moved more and more into the production of inferior goods by less skilled hands for the market, or "slop," trade. This was especially true in certain trades: shoemaking, tailoring, printing, and furniture making.

The new market economy produced some enormous benefits. The most obvious was the availability of cheap and plentiful consumer goods to all classes and all sections of the country. However, competition between entrepreneurs led to downward pressure on wages and, at its worst, to hiring women and children in the nation's first sweatshops. Craft work lost its prerequisites of skill, as once respected artisan labor was fractured into a few simple tasks. The new working arrangements undermined the spirit of mutuality in the shop.

Masters either had to accept the new realities or become wage workers themselves. Some masters survived as contractors or merchant industrialists. Others left for cities yet untouched by the flood of goods from the market trade. Many who hung on, however, faced bankruptcy and return to journeywork. Journeymen faced the opposite problem. With declining wages and an increased amount of capital necessary to start up a concern, it became less and less likely that they would ever become masters. Journeymen could now expect to remain dependent on wage work for the rest of their lives.

Several objective measures indicated the increasing social distance between masters and journeymen. Along with greater disparities of wealth, patterns of residential segregation emerged. Journeymen began to form groups of working men to resist the downward pressure on wages. Masters formed opposing organizations. At the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries, journeymen in the major consumer trades organized on their own. Masters generally accommodated their demands until about 1805, when the unsettling Jeffersonian economy led masters to take a harder line.

By the late 1820s and 1830, influenced by British radical ideas including the labor theory of value, journeymen began to develop a clearer form of class consciousness.
Journeymen came to view themselves as workers, rather than as future masters. Out of the breakdown of the artisan system of labor came the beginning of industrial classes.

DOCUMENTS

Introduction

The text mentions the textile factories in Waltham and Lowell. The following documents are letters from Mary Paul to her father in Claremont, New Hampshire. The Lowell and Waltham mills hired primarily young, single women. Most came from the neighboring countryside. The corporations built boardinghouses to accommodate recent migrants and established paternalistic regulations governing the women. Regulations required that women workers be in their boardinghouses by 10:00 each evening and that operators of the boardinghouses report violations to the mill's management. At least in the early years, the women were required to attend church. Such controls were designed to protect the reputations of the workers and to assure Yankee parents that their daughters might leave home to work in the mills without injury to their persons or their reputations. In the mid-1830s, the women earned about $3.25 for a seventy-three-hour week. Room and board in a company boardinghouse cost about $1.25 a week. These earnings compared favorably with incomes from teaching, domestic service, or sewing.


Questions for Discussion

1. The letter of December 21, 1845, expresses concern about health. Why would this be of even greater concern in 1845 than it would today?

2. What can you tell about Mary's relationship with her father?

3. How does Mary's experience compare with the ideology of the day, which defined women as wives and mothers? Women were considered to be suited for domestic pursuits and expected to be subservient members first of their fathers' households and then of their husbands'. Mary lived away from home for twelve years before her marriage and enjoyed a degree of social as well as economic independence.

4. How does Mary's experience compare with the description of the Waltham System in the text? Mary went to work in the mid-1840s. How does that relate to Garraty's discussion of the Waltham System?
Letters of Mary Paul

Saturday Sept. 13th 1845

Dear Father

...I want you to consent to let me go to Lowell if you can. I think it would be much better for me than to stay about here. I could earn more to begin with than I can any where about here. I am in need of clothes which I cannot get if I stay about here and for that reason I want to go to Lowell or some other place. We all think if I could go with some steady girl that I might do well. I want you to think of it and make up your mind....

Mary

***************

Woodstock Nov 8th 1845

Dear Father

As you wanted me to let you know when I am going to start for Lowell, I improve this opportunity to write you. Next Thursday the 13th of this month is the day set or the Thursday afternoon. I should like to have you come down. If you come bring Henry if you can for I should like to see him before I go...

Mary

***************

Lowell Nov 20th 1845

Dear Father

...Went to a boarding house and staid until Monday night. On Saturday after I got here Luthera Griffith went round with me to find a place but we were unsuccessful. On Monday we started again and were more successful. We found a place in a spinning room and the next morning I went to work. I like very well have 50 cts first payment increasing every payment as I get along in work have a first rate overseer and a very good boarding place....It cost me $3.25 to come. Stage fare was $3.00 and lodging at Windsor, 25 cts. Had to pay only 25 cts for board for 9 days after I got here before I went into the mill. Had 2.50 left with which I got a bonnet and some other small articles....

excuse bad writing and mistakes
This from your own daughter
Mary
Lowell Dec 21st 1845

Dear Father

...I am well which is one comfort. My life and health are spared while others are cut off. Last Thursday one girl fell down and broke her neck which caused instant death. She was going in or coming out of the mill and slipped down it being very icy. The same day a man was killed by the cars. Another had nearly all of his ribs broken. Another was nearly killed by falling down and having a bale of cotton fall on him. Last Tuesday we were paid. In all I had six dollars and sixty cents paid $4.68 for board. With the rest I got me a pair of rubbers and a pair of 50 cts shoes. Next payment I am to have a dollar a week beside my board....Perhaps you would like something about our regulations about going in and coming out of the mill. At 5 o'clock in the morning the bell rings for the folks to get up and get breakfast. At half past six it rings for the girls to get up and at seven they are called into the mill. At half past 12 we have dinner are called back again at one and stay till half past seven. I get along very well with my work....

This from
Mary S Paul

***************

Lowell April 12th 1846

Dear Father

...The overseer tells me that he never had a girl get along better than I do and that he will do the best he can by me. I stand it well, though they tell me that I am growing very poor. I was paid nine shillings a week last payment and am to have more this one though we have been out considerable for backwater which will take off a good deal¹. The Agent promises to pay us nearly as much as we should have made but I do not think that he will....I have a very good boarding place have enough to eat and that which is good enough. The girls are all kind and obliging. The girls that I room with are all from Vermont and good girls too....

¹ Mary quoted her wages in English currency, but, according to Thomas Dublin, she was almost certainly paid in American money. Nine shillings would be equal to $1.50. Mary was referring to her wages exclusive of room and board charges. "Backwater" was caused by heavy run-off from rains and melting snow. The high water levels caused water to back up and block the waterwheel.
"Democratizing" Politics. While Jefferson believed that ordinary citizens could be educated to determine what was right, Jackson believed that they knew what was right by instinct. The new western states drew up constitutions that eliminated property qualifications for voting and holding office. They opened many more offices to election rather than appointment. Only in Delaware and South Carolina did legislatures continue to choose presidential electors; in other states they were selected by popular vote. This period saw the final disestablishment of churches and the beginning of the free-school movement. Officeholders came to regard themselves as representatives, as well as leaders, and they appealed more openly and intensely for votes. As voting became more important, so did competition between candidates. It took money, people, and organization to run campaigns and get out the vote. Parties became powerful institutions with their own bureaucracies. Loyal party workers were rewarded with offices when their party won.

1828: The New Party System in Embryo. Jackson believed that he had been cheated out of the presidency in 1824, and he began campaigning for 1828 almost immediately after Adams's selection by the House of Representatives. In the campaign of 1828, Jackson avoided taking a stand on issues. Both sides resorted to character assassination. Voters turned out in far greater numbers than four years earlier, and they chose Jackson.

The Jacksonian Appeal. While his supporters liked to cast him as the political heir of Jefferson, in many ways Jackson more closely resembled the more conservative Washington. A wealthy land speculator, he owned a large plantation and many slaves. Nor was Jackson quite the rough-hewn frontiersman he sometimes seemed; his manners and lifestyle were those of a southern planter. Nevertheless, he became a symbol for a movement supported by a new, democratically oriented generation, which enabled him to draw support from every section and every class.

The Spoils System. The concept of filling offices with one's supporters was not new, but Jackson's policy appeared revolutionary since there had not been a major political shift in many years. Jackson offered the principle of rotation as an underpinning of his policy. He believed that the duties of public officials were so simple that anyone could perform them. Rotating offices would permit more citizens to participate in the tasks of government and prevent the development of an entrenched bureaucracy. Rhetoric and theory aside, most of Jackson's appointments came from the same social and intellectual elite as those they replaced, and he did not try to rotate civil servants in the War and Navy departments.
President of All the People. Jackson conceived of himself as the direct representative of the people and the embodiment of national power. He vetoed more bills than all of his predecessors combined. Yet he had no desire to expand federal authority at the expense of the states. His contempt for expert advice, even in areas where his ignorance was almost total, led to a number of unwise decisions.

Sectional Tensions Revived. Jackson steered a moderate course on issues dividing the sections, urging a slight reduction of the tariff and "constitutional" internal improvements. He proposed that surplus federal revenues be "distributed" to the states. However, if the federal government distributed its surplus revenues, it could not reduce the price of public lands without going into debt. Nonetheless, westerners wanted cheap land. In the Senate, Webster successfully blocked a West-South alliance based on cheap land and low tariffs.

Jackson: "The Bank...I Will Kill It!" Jackson won reelection in 1832, partly based on his promise to destroy the second Bank of the United States. After Marshall declared its constitutionality and Landon Cheves established it on a sound footing, the Bank of the United States flourished. Cheves's successor, Nicholas Biddle, realized that the Bank of the United States could act as a rudimentary central bank. He attempted to use the institution to control credit and compel local banks to maintain adequate reserves of specie. At the same time, however, the nation had an insatiable need for capital and credit. Some bankers chafed under Biddle's restraints. Regional jealousies also came into play, as did distrust of chartered corporations as agents of special privilege.

Jackson's Bank Veto. Opposition to the Bank remained unfocused until Jackson brought it together. Biddle drew closer to Clay and Webster, who hoped to use the bank issue against Jackson. Clay and Webster urged Biddle to ask Congress to renew the Bank's charter early. The bill passed Congress, and Jackson vetoed it. After his reelection, Jackson withdrew government funds from the Bank. Faced with the withdrawal of so much cash, Biddle contracted his operations. He further contracted credit by presenting all state bank notes for conversion into specie and limiting his own bank's loans. Money became scarce, and a serious panic threatened. Pressure mounted on Jackson, who refused to budge. Eventually, the pressure shifted to Biddle, who began to lend freely. The crisis ended.

Jackson Versus Calhoun. Calhoun coveted the presidency. In addition, he and Jackson shared a deep personal animosity. However, the two men were not far apart ideologically, except on the paramount issue of the right of a state to overrule federal authority. Like most westerners, Jackson favored internal improvements, but he preferred that local projects be left to the states. He vetoed the Maysville Road Bill because the route was wholly within Kentucky.

Indian Removals. Jackson also took a states' rights position in the controversy between the Cherokee Indians and Georgia. He pursued a policy of removing Indians from the path of white settlement. Some tribes resisted and were subdued by troops. The Cherokee attempted to hold their lands by adjusting to white ways. In spite of several treaties that seemed to establish the legitimacy of their government, Georgia refused to recognize it.
Georgia passed a law declaring all Cherokee laws void and the Cherokee lands part of Georgia. In *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*, Marshall ruled that the Cherokee were "not a foreign state" and therefore could not sue in a federal court, but in *Worcester v. Georgia*, he ruled that the state could not control the Cherokee or their territory. Marshall also overturned the conviction for murder of a Cherokee named Corn Tassel on the ground that the crime had taken place in Cherokee territory. Jackson, however, backed Georgia. He insisted that no independent nation could exist within the United States. Eventually, the United States forced about 15,000 Cherokee to leave Georgia for lands in Oklahoma; about 4,000 died on the way.

**The Nullification Crisis.** South Carolina's planters objected to a new tariff law passed in 1832 that lowered duties less than they had hoped. They also resented northern agitation against slavery. Radicals in the state saw the two issues as related (both represented the tyranny of the majority), and they turned to Calhoun's doctrine of nullification as a logical defense. Jackson believed that if a state could nullify federal law, the Union could not exist. South Carolina passed an ordinance of nullification prohibiting collection of tariff duties in the state and voted to authorize the raising of an army. Jackson began military preparations of his own. In a presidential proclamation, he warned that "disunion by armed force is treason." Congress compromised by reducing the tariff and by passing a Force Bill granting the president additional authority to enforce the revenue laws. Sobered by Jackson's response and professing to be satisfied with the token reductions of the new tariff, South Carolina repealed the Nullification Ordinance. South Carolina attempted to save face by nullifying the Force Act.

**Boom and Bust.** An increased volume of currency caused land prices to soar. Proceeds from land sales wiped out the government's debt and produced a surplus. Alarmed by the speculative mania, Jackson issued a Specie Circular, which required purchasers of government land to pay in gold or silver. Demand immediately slackened, and prices sagged. Speculators defaulted on mortgages, and banks could not recover enough on foreclosed property to recover their loans. People rushed to withdraw their money in the form of specie, and banks exhausted their supplies. Panic swept the country. Numerous factors caused such swings in the economic cycle, but Jackson's policies exaggerated them.

**Jacksonianism Abroad.** Jackson's exaggerated patriotism led him to push relentlessly for the solution of minor problems, and he did achieve some diplomatic successes. Great Britain agreed to several reciprocal trade agreements, including one that finally opened British West Indian ports to American ships. France agreed to pay compensation for damages to American property during the Napoleonic wars. When, however, the French Chamber of Deputies refused to appropriate the necessary funds, Jackson sent a blistering message to Congress asking for reprisals against French property. Congress wisely took no action, which led Jackson to suspend diplomatic relations with France and order the navy readied. The French government finally appropriated the money.

**The Jacksonians.** Jacksonian Democrats included rich and poor, easterners and westerners, abolitionists and slaveholders. If it was not yet a close-knit national organization, the party agreed on certain basic principles: suspicion of special privilege and large business
corporations, freedom of economic opportunity, political freedom (at least for white males), and the conviction that ordinary citizens could perform the tasks of government. Democrats also tended to favor states' rights. Jacksonians supported opportunities for the less affluent (such as public education) but showed no desire to penalize the wealthy or to intervene in economic affairs to aid the underprivileged.

**Rise of the Whigs.** Jackson's opposition remained less cohesive. Opposition to Jackson held them together. Dissident groups began to call themselves Whigs. Those who could not accept the peculiarities of Jacksonian finance or had no taste for the anti-intellectual bent of the administration were drawn to the Whigs. Ideological divisions and the lack of a dominant leader made the Whigs slow to develop an effective party organization. In 1836, they relied on a series of favorite son candidates in an effort to throw the election into the House of Representatives. The strategy failed to defeat Jackson's handpicked successor, Martin Van Buren.

**Martin Van Buren: Jacksonianism Without Jackson.** In spite of his talents as a political manipulator, Van Buren had statesmanlike qualities and an engaging personality. He approached most problems pragmatically. He fought the Bank of the United States but opposed irresponsible state banks as well. While he supported public construction of internal improvements, he preferred state rather than national programs.

Van Buren had the misfortune to take office just as the Panic of 1837 hit. Although frightening, the panic was short-lived. Just as the country recovered from the Panic of 1837, cotton prices declined sharply in 1839. State governments defaulted on their debts, which discouraged investors. A general economic depression lasted until 1843. Van Buren did not cause the depression, but his policies did nothing to help. His refusal to assume any responsibility for the general welfare has led at least one historian to argue that the Whigs, not the Democrats, were the "positive liberals" of the era.

The depression convinced Van Buren that he needed to find some place other than the state banks to keep federal funds. He settled on the idea of removing the government from all banking activities. The Independent Treasury Act called for the construction of government-owned vaults to store federal revenues. All payments to the government were to be made in hard cash. The plan was economically irresponsible, but the system worked reasonably well for many years, thanks to a lucky combination of circumstances.

**The Log Cabin Campaign.** The depression hurt the Democrats, but it did not cause Van Buren's defeat in 1840. The Whigs were better organized than they had been four years earlier, and they stole the Democrats' tactics by nominating a popular general and shouting praises of the common man. They contrasted the simplicity of William Henry Harrison with the suave Van Buren. Far from coming from a log cabin, Harrison came from a distinguished family and comfortable circumstances. A huge turnout elected Harrison by a large margin.

Less than a month after his inauguration, Harrison fell ill and died. With the succession of John Tyler, events took a new turn, one that would lead to civil war.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The difference between Jeffersonian democracy and Jacksonian democracy.
2. The ways in which politics became more democratic in the age of Jackson.
3. The second party system.
4. The spoils system and the principle of rotation.
5. Which factors led to a revival of sectional tensions.
7. The factors leading to the nullification crisis and to its settlement.
8. Why Jackson was determined to destroy the Bank of the United States and what the results were of his doing so.
9. The basic principles on which Jacksonian Democrats agreed.
10. The formation of the Whig party and its ideology.
11. The reasons for Van Buren's defeat in 1840.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Was Jacksonian democracy really democratic?
2. Did Jackson's policies help or harm what Jacksonians would have called "the common man"? Apply the information in the “Debating the Past” section to the information in the chapter.
3. The text notes that Jackson was at once an average and an ideal American, "one the people could identify with and still revere." Does this description apply to presidents before and after Jackson? Is this, in fact, the key to a successful candidacy? Does this help a president govern? Apply this description to Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, and Ronald Reagan.
4. What were the differences between the Democrats and the Whigs?
5. Who remained excluded from Jacksonian democracy?
Not all historians agree with the assessment of Jacksonian democracy found in the text. One group of historians have argued that the most significant divisions in nineteenth-century American society were neither economic nor class but rather ethnic and religious. These historians are known as ethno-cultural historians. Lee Benson, who is mentioned in another context in this chapter, pioneered an ethno-cultural interpretation of politics in the Age of Jackson.

Great religious revivals swept through America in the eighteenth century and again in the decades following the 1820s. In reaction to these revivals, there was an upswing in liturgical theology as well. This new ritualist theology was not a purely negative reaction to revivalism. It stressed the positive values of institutional formality, doctrine, creed, ritual, and hierarchy. A central element in liturgical theology was particularism, the belief that one's particular denomination was the one true church. Therefore, it followed that the church had the responsibility to attend to public morality; the state had no right to interfere. Good examples of liturgical faiths would be Roman Catholicism, Episcopalianism, and Judaism.

Pietists, on the other hand, rejected ritualism. The key to their theology was the belief that all people could be saved by a direct confrontation with Christ—not through an institutional church. The conversion experience held a central place in their faith. However, one also had to behave in a pure manner. Good examples of pietist denominations would be Baptists and Methodists.

Members of pietistic churches could be expelled for unbecoming behavior. In contrast, liturgical churches have institutionalized means for dealing with lapses in behavior (such as Catholic confession and the Jewish Day of Atonement). They expel members only for heresy.

During the religious awakening of the early nineteenth century, almost every Protestant denomination split between pietists and liturgicals. Usually one or the other won out and came to control the denomination.

The bridge between theology and politics consisted of pietist demands that the government remove the major obstacle to the purification of society through revivalistic Christianity—namely public immorality. Their demands took various forms: sabatarianism (advocacy of blue laws, which required that businesses stay closed on Sundays), the abolition of saloons, total temperance, and abolitionism. Many native evangelicals saw the influx of Catholics, and to a lesser extent Jews, as the chief source of corruption and decay of civic virtue.

Party lines formed in the 1830s along these lines. Whigs, as a rule, tended to be pietist and Democrats liturgicals. Having failed to convert the "sinners," pietists sought at least to control their behavior. They sought to do so by gaining control of the government through the Whig party. The "sinners" vehemently resisted. Ritualists certainly did not see their social customs as sinful. Germans and Irish were not about to give up their beer or, for that matter, even an occasional beer or two on Sundays. Italians had no intention of giving up wine with their meals. Beer and wine formed an important part of their customs and hospitality. Indeed, many liturgical religions use wine in religious ceremonies. Therefore,
liturgicals banded together to oppose the encroachments of the pietists. They sought to
preserve their religious values through their own school systems and through resistance to
pietist attempts to dictate behavior through the institutional power of the state. The
Democratic party became the vehicle through which they expressed their views.

This hypothesis presents some fascinating possibilities. No informed treatment of
nineteenth-century politics can ignore the findings of the ethno-cultural historians. Ethnic,
cultural, and religious issues clearly played an important role in determining party allegiances
and in dividing the country on controversial issues.

There are, however, weaknesses in the ethno-cultural argument. The greatest flaw is
the most obvious. The Civil War, the central event of the American nineteenth century, was
fought not between Protestants and Catholics but between North and South. Second, some
of the cruder ethno-cultural historians replace economic determinism, which they reject as
simplistic, with a kind of cultural determinism, which is just as rigid and simplistic as the
most poorly written Marxist history. Moreover, cultural determinism fails. By the ethno-
cultural school's calculations, for example, Lincoln should have been a Democrat.

If, however, one combines elements of the ethno-cultural analysis with more
traditional accounts of the Age of Jackson, it becomes possible to begin to make sense out of
this tumultuous and complex era.

For further information on the ethno-cultural interpretation, see Lee Benson, The
Concept of Jacksonian Democracy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961); Ronald P.
Formisano, The Transformation of Political Culture: Massachusetts Parties, 1790s-1840s
(New York: Oxford, 1983); and The Birth of Mass Political Parties: Michigan, 1827-1861
The text mentions one of the darkest moments in American history, the forcible removal of thousands of Cherokee from their homeland in the southern uplands to Oklahoma. George Washington's administration adopted a policy designed to "civilize" the Indians. More than any other Indian nation, the Cherokee embarked on this course. Faced with a diminishing land base, many Cherokee welcomed the government's program. However, no amount of assimilation aided the Cherokee when the state of Georgia demanded their land.

In the first document, an excerpt from his First Annual Message to Congress, Jackson articulated his position. Criticizing previous attempts to assimilate the tribes, Jackson called on Congress to pass legislation that would remove them to land west of the Mississippi. Congress responded with the Indian Removal Act of 1830.


The third document is from Elias Budinot's Letters and Other Papers Relating to Cherokee Affairs: Being a Reply to Sundry Publications by John Ross (1837). Educated at a mission school in Connecticut, Budinot was editor of the official organ of the Cherokee Nation, the Cherokee Phoenix, from 1828 to 1832. In that capacity, he argued against removal. In 1832, however, Budinot began to reconsider his position and proposed opening the Phoenix to debate on the issue. When the Cherokee Council and Principal Chief John Ross refused his request, Budinot resigned. Cherokee leaders divided over the issue of removal. Ross led the opposition to removal; Budinot, along with his uncle, Major Ridge, and his cousin, John Ridge (Major Ridge's son), led the faction who believed that the Cherokee could survive as a people only by agreeing to removal. Finally, a small group of Cherokee met with United States Treaty Commissioner John F. Schermerhorn at New Echota in December 1835 and ratified a removal treaty. The treaty did not end the dispute within the Cherokee nation. John Ross attempted to have the treaty abrogated and published a pamphlet attacking it. In response, Budinot published the spirited defense of his position from which the third document is taken.

Questions for Discussion

1. How would you describe Jackson's attitude toward the Indians?

2. To what extent was the removal "voluntary," as Jackson suggested?

3. What kind of life did the Cherokee writer expect to find in the western territory?

4. Why does Jackson believe that Indians and whites cannot live together? Is his position borne out by the history of the Cherokee?

5. Do Budinot's arguments in favor of removal make sense?

6. Do you find it curious that Budinot, an educated and highly assimilated Cherokee, would argue for removal in the name of preserving the Cherokee people? What does he fear if the Cherokee remain? What does this say about his attitude towards his own people? To what extent does his opinion of the prospects for Cherokee and whites living together coincide with Jackson's?

7. In what ways did the life and career of Horace Greeley (in the American Lives section) reflect the social transformations described in Chapter 10 (particularly in the sections "A Restless People" and "Backwoods Utopias")?
Jackson's First Annual Message to Congress (1829)

The condition and ulterior destiny of the Indian tribes within the limits of some of our states have become objects of much interest and importance. It has long been the policy of government to introduce among them the arts of civilization, in the hope of gradually reclaiming them from a wandering life. This policy has, however, been coupled with another wholly incompatible with its success. Professing a desire to civilize and settle them, we have at the same time lost no opportunity to purchase their lands and thrust them farther into the wilderness.

Our conduct toward these people is deeply interesting to our national character. Their present condition, contrasted with what they once were, makes a most powerful appeal to our sympathies. Our ancestors found them the uncontrolled possessors of these vast regions. By persuasion and force they have been made to retire from river to river and from mountain to mountain, until some of the tribes have become extinct and others have left but remnants to preserve for awhile their once terrible names. Surrounded by the whites with their arts of civilization, which, by destroying the resources of the savage, doom him to weakness and decay, the fate of the Mohegan, the Narragansett, and the Delaware is fast overtaking the Choctaw, the Cherokee, and the Creek. That this fate surely awaits them if they remain within the limits of the states does not admit of a doubt. Humanity and national honor demand that every effort should be made to avert so great a calamity.

As a means of effecting this end, I suggest for your consideration the propriety of setting apart an ample district west of the Mississippi, and without the limits of any state or territory now formed, to be guaranteed to the Indian tribes as long as they shall occupy it, each tribe having a distinct control over the portion designated for its use. There they may be secured in the enjoyment of governments of their own choice, subject to no other control from the United States than such as may be necessary to preserve peace on the frontier and between the several tribes. There the benevolent may endeavor to teach them the arts of civilization, and, by promoting union and harmony among them, to raise up an interesting commonwealth, destined to perpetuate the race and to attest the humanity and justice of this government.

This emigration should be voluntary, for it would be as cruel as unjust to compel the aborigines to abandon the graves of their fathers and seek a home in a distant land. But they should be distinctly informed that if they remain within the limits of the states they must be subject to their laws.
Memorial of the Cherokee Nation (1830)

We are aware that some persons suppose it will be for our advantage to remove beyond the Mississippi. We think otherwise. Our people universally think otherwise. Thinking that it would be fatal to their interests, they have almost to a man sent their memorial to congress, deprecating the necessity of a removal....It is incredible that Georgia should ever have enacted the oppressive laws to which reference is here made, unless she had supposed that something extremely terrific in its character was necessary in order to make the Cherokees willing to remove. We are not willing to remove; and if we could be brought to this extremity, it would be not by argument, nor because our judgment was satisfied, not because our condition will be improved; but only because we cannot endure to be deprived of our national and individual rights and subjected to a process of intolerable oppression.

We wish to remain on the land of our fathers. We have a perfect and original right to remain without interruption or molestation. The treaties with us, and laws of the United States made in pursuance of treaties, guaranty our residence and our privileges, and secure us against intruders. Our only request is, that these treaties may be fulfilled, and these laws executed.

But if we are compelled to leave our country, we see nothing but ruin before us. The country west of the Arkansas territory is unknown to us. From what we can learn of it, we have no prepossessions in its favor. All the inviting parts of it, as we believe, are preoccupied by various Indian nations, to which it has been assigned. They would regard us as intruders....The far greater part of that region is, beyond all controversy, badly supplied with wood and water; and no Indian tribe can live as agriculturists without these articles. All our neighbors...would speak a language totally different from ours, and practice different customs. The original possessors of that region are now wandering savages lurking for prey in the neighborhood....Were the country to which we are urged much better than it is represented to be,...still it is not the land of our birth, nor of our affections. It contains neither the scenes of our childhood, nor the graves of our fathers.

...We have been called a poor, ignorant, and degraded people. We certainly are not rich; nor have we ever boasted of our knowledge, or our moral or intellectual elevation. But there is not a man within our limits so ignorant as not to know that he has a right to live on the land of his fathers, in the possession of his immemorial privileges, and that this right has been acknowledged by the United States; nor is there a man so degraded as not to feel a keen sense of injury, on being deprived of his right and driven into exile....
"What is to be done?" was a natural inquiry, after we found that all our efforts to obtain redress from the General Government, on the land of our fathers, had been of no avail. The first rupture among ourselves was the moment we presumed to answer that question. To a portion of the Cherokee people it early became evident that the interest of their countrymen and the happiness of their posterity, depended upon an entire change of policy. Instead of contending uselessly against superior power, the only course left, was, to yield to circumstances over which they had no control.

...You seem to be absorbed altogether in the pecuniary aspect of this nation's affairs; hence your extravagant demands for the lands we are compelled to relinquish; your ideas of the value of the gold mines, which, if they had been peaceably possessed by the Cherokees, would have ruined them as soon as the operation of the State laws have done; of the value of our marble quarries, our mountains and forests. Indeed, you seem to have forgotten that your people are a community of moral beings, capable of an elevation to an equal standing with the most civilized and virtuous, or a deterioration to the level of the most degraded, of our race. Upon what principle, then, could you have made the assertion that you are reported to have made, "that the Cherokees had not suffered one-half what their country was worth," but upon the principle of valuing your nation in dollars and cents? If you meant simply the physical sufferings of this people, your assertion may be listened to with some patience; but can it be possible that you, who have claimed to be their leader and guardian, have forgotten that there is another kind of suffering which they have endured, and will endure as long as they are kept in these perplexities of a far more important nature? Can it be possible that you consider the mere pains and privations of the body, and the loss of a paltry sum of money, of a paramount importance to the depression of the mind and the degradation and pollution of the soul? That the difficulties under which they are laboring, originating from the operation of the State laws, and their absorption by a white population, will affect them in that light, I need not here stop to argue with you: that they have already affected them, is a fact too palpable, too notorious, for us to deny it: that they will increase to affect them, in proportion to the delay of applying the remedy, we need only judge from past experience.

...In the light that I consider my countrymen, not as mere animals, and to judge of their happiness by their condition as such, which, to be sure, is bad enough, but as moral beings, to be affected for better or for worse by moral circumstances, I say their condition is wretched. Look, my dear sir, around you, and see the progress that vice and immorality have already made! see the spread of intemperance, and the wretchedness and misery it has already occasioned!...

If the dark picture which I have here drawn is a true one, and no candid person will say it is an exaggerated one, can we see a brighter prospect ahead? In another country, and under other circumstances, there is a better prospect. Removal, then, is the only remedy, the only practicable remedy. By it there may be finally a renovation; our people may rise from their very ashes, to become prosperous and happy, and a credit to our race. Such has been and is now my opinion, and under such a settled opinion I have acted in all this affair. My language has been; "fly for your lives;" it is now the same. I would say to my countrymen, you among the rest, fly from the moral pestilence that will finally destroy our nation.
CHAPTER 10
The Making of Middle-Class America

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

_Tocqueville and Beaumont in America._ Two French aristocrats, Alexis de Tocqueville and Gustave de Beaumont, were among the many foreign visitors who came to observe and record American manners, institutions, and society in the first half of the nineteenth century. Tocqueville and Beaumont believed that Europe was passing from its aristocratic past to a democratic future and that the best way to prepare for this change was to study American society and its republican government. Tocqueville's observations provided the material for his _Democracy in America_, published in 1835.

_Tocqueville in Judgment._ Nothing struck Tocqueville more than the equality he observed among Americans. Although Americans did not live in total equality, the inequalities that existed among White males were not enforced by institutions or supported by public opinion. Moreover, inequalities among Americans paled in comparison with those of Europe. Many of Tocqueville's observations represented oversimplifications. He had little interest in industrialization and urbanization or how they affected the country. He failed to recognize the substantial poverty that existed in Jacksonian America, particularly in the cities.

_A Restless People._ European observers often commented on the restlessness of Americans and their tendency to pack up and move in search of land, work, or other opportunity. Americans migrated both toward the unsettled frontier and toward established urban areas. Boston, New York, and Philadelphia expanded rapidly in the first half of the nineteenth century. The emergence and growth of new towns were even more significant than the growth of large cities. Urbanization transformed the Northeast and the Old Northwest but had little impact on the South. Despite the growth of America's population, both from natural increase and immigration, much of the country remained sparsely settled.

_The Family Recast._ The factory system and the growth of cities undermined the importance of the home and family as the unit of economic production. Husbands spent more time away from the home, which altered family relationships. Wives exercised more power, if for no other reason than they were always present in the home. Married women came to assume more responsibility for household affairs and were expected to attend only to those affairs. This trend widened the gap between the middle and lower classes. Many considered it a dereliction of duty for a middle-class wife to take a job outside the home. Such an attitude could not develop in lower-class families where everyone had to work. The middle class "cult of true womanhood" placed women on a pedestal for their selfless devotion to home and family. Some women objected to making a cult out of womanhood; they maintained that real women would inevitably fall short of the ideal. Women, particularly in urban areas, married
later than the previous generation and had fewer children. Smaller families led parents to value children more highly and to lavish more time and affection on them.

**The Second Great Awakening.** In New England, evangelists who rejected both orthodox Calvinism and deistic thought led the Second Great Awakening. They stressed the mercy and love of God and the importance of personal salvation. Charles Grandison Finney, the most prominent evangelical leader, led revival meetings in New York that combined sermons, personal testimonials of salvation, and hymn singing. Finney's theology dismissed Calvinism as a "theological fiction." Salvation was available to anyone. The revivalism of the Second Great Awakening appealed to uprooted workers who sought employment in the towns along the Erie Canal and to middle-class women who felt responsible for the spiritual well-being of their families.

**The Era of Associations.** Voluntary associations served as a pillar of the emerging middle class. These associations promoted various philanthropic and religious causes. Leaders came from the upper class, but the middle class formed the bulk of membership.

**Backwoods Utopias.** Some reformers sought to achieve social reorganization and personal reform by establishing small-scale communities outside of American society. One of the most influential of these communities, the Shakers, practiced celibacy, held their property in common, and made a virtue of living simply. Other religious colonies included the Amana and Oneida communities, which prospered by developing manufacturing skills. Members of the Oneida community practiced "complex marriage," which held that every man in the community was married to every woman. Joseph Smith founded the Mormon faith in western New York in the 1820s. Their unorthodox religious views and exclusivism caused resentment among non-Mormons. Hostility and violence in Ohio and Illinois forced them to move westward. They eventually settled at Salt Lake City. These religious communities were more significant as reflections of the urgent reform spirit than they were for their accomplishments. Other communitarian experiments included Robert Owen's at New Harmony and the colonies created by Fourierists in northern and western states.

**The Age of Reform.** Other efforts at reform included the rehabilitation of criminals and better care for the physically and mentally disabled. Reformers demanded that deviant and dependent members of the community be taken from their present corrupting surroundings and placed in institutions where they could be trained, educated, or rehabilitated. However humane the motivations of the reformers might have been, the institutions they created seem inhumane by modern standards.

"Demon Rum." The temperance movement, the most widely supported and successful reform movement, addressed a real problem. Americans in the 1820s consumed prodigious quantities of alcohol. The formation of the American Temperance Union in 1826 marked the beginning of a national crusade against drunkenness. The temperance movement aroused opposition, particularly from German and Irish immigrants, when it moved beyond calls for restraint to demands for total prohibition of alcohol. By the 1840s, reformers had secured legislation imposing licensing systems and taxes on alcohol. By 1855, a dozen states had
followed Maine's example and prohibited the manufacture and sale of liquor. The nation's per capita consumption of alcohol plummeted.

**The Abolitionist Crusade.** Abolitionism attracted few followers until the 1820s. Antislavery northerners considered slavery wrong, but they believed that the Constitution obliged them to tolerate it in states where it existed. Advocates of forced abolition were regarded as irresponsible extremists. Most critics of slavery, therefore, confined themselves to urging colonization or persuading slaveholders to treat their slaves humanely. Benjamin Lundy, a Quaker newspaper editor, was one of the few to go further, and even he advocated persuasion rather than the use of federal power to end slavery. His assistant, William Lloyd Garrison, demanded the immediate emancipation of slaves and full racial equality. Garrison's unyielding position, his refusal to engage in politics, and his support for female abolitionist lecturers divided the movement. Many blacks advocated abolition long before white abolitionists began to attract attention. The most prominent black abolitionist was Frederick Douglass, a former slave, who insisted on emancipation as well as full social and political equality.

**Women's Rights.** Women who opposed slavery confronted the opposition of men who objected to the participation of women in political affairs. Thus, many female abolitionists also became advocates for women's rights. Some equated women's position in society with that of blacks. Advocates of rights for women who began their careers as abolitionists included Sarah and Angelina Grimke, Lucretia Mott, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Stanton, Mott, and others organized a meeting at Seneca Falls in 1848 and drafted a Declaration of Principles patterned on the Declaration of Independence. Susan B. Anthony became a leading campaigner for women's rights in the 1850s. She recognized the need for effective organization to bring pressure on male-dominated society. However, feminists achieved few practical results in the era of reform.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. What Tocqueville meant when he commented on the "equality" he found in the United States.

2. The impact of the factory system on the structure of the family.

3. The doctrine of "separate spheres."

4. The social origins of the Second Great Awakening.

5. The emergence of voluntary associations and the social role they filled.

6. Ways in which the various utopian communities differed and ways in which they were similar.
7. The connection between religious revival and reform.

8. Why abolitionists met with such hostility in the North.

9. The origins of the women's movement.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. How did the rise of manufacturing contribute to the growth of the cities?

2. Why, of all the reform movements, did abolitionism prove to be the most divisive?

3. Michel Foucault criticized modern asylums for repressing individuality (see the “Debating the Past” section). While these institutions were undoubtedly inhumane by today’s standards (see “The Age of Reform” section), was the close supervision and imposition of rigid order characteristic of such institutions more cruel than the physical punishments they replaced? What standards and what evidence should be used in drawing a conclusion?

4. What would have been the appeal of the evangelical and utopian religion of the Second Great Awakening (see the sections “The Great Awakening” and Backwoods Utopias”) for Sojourner Truth?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The impulse toward perfectionism took many forms, including millenarian churches, utopian communities, abolitionism, temperance, and the establishment of institutions for dealing with social problems. The reform impulse pervaded all aspects of American life and manifested itself in many ways. One of the most interesting manifestations was the movement to reform the American diet.

"We may safely take it for granted," contended a contributor to the Southern Review, "that almost every man, woman, and child in this country, habitually eats and drinks twice as much every day...as is necessary."

Russell Trall, author of the New Hydropathic Cook-Book, sounded positively modern when he warned that "frying is the worst of all simple modes of cookery...Of all common articles of food, those that are saturated with butter or fat, while at a boiling heat, are the most pernicious." Trall believed that proper nutrition accomplished "the replenishment of the tissue, not the accumulation of fat" and that fat was "a disease, and a fattened animal, be it a hog or an alderman, is a diseased animal." His teachings ran counter both to the common practice of using animal fats to improve the taste of food and to the common belief that animal fats provided energy and nutrition. Moreover, ample girth had been considered a sign of success and even beauty for centuries.
Catharine Beecher joined Trall in attacking overeating, a vice that she associated primarily with the working classes. In addition, Beecher criticized "students and men of business" for rushing through their midday meals. She recommended half an hour of quiet before partaking.

Other dietary reformers focused on Americans' taste for "condiments." These critics argued that mustard, the hot red peppers native to America, and imported black pepper excited the appetite to an unnatural degree and inhibited the effects of chewing and salivation. Trall identified salt, which he regarded as a "foreign irritant," as a great health hazard. Beecher agreed that "articles preserved in salt, sugar, or vinegar, are neither as easily digested, nor as healthful as those in the natural state." (The "natural state" did not mean raw.)

Many reformers urged the consumption of lean meats, argued that animal organs were unfit to eat, recommended the consumption of herbivores as the least harmful meat, and warned against eating pigs (the most common meat in antebellum America).

Sylvester Graham advocated baking bread at home and using whole grain flours. He contended that the failing health of Americans could be reversed by vegetarianism—and by "Graham" bread and flour. He founded a boardinghouse in New York, based on his dietary principles. For Graham, diet was only part of a larger reformist agenda. He wrote almost obsessively about masturbation and connected the "problem" with diet. He also regarded theater and high manners as dangerous threats to morality.

Graham's attempt to reform through diet never gained a large following, although it did find some followers among the various utopian communes. Graham and other dietary reformers were part of the complex of perfectionist reforms that grew out of the Second Great Awakening. They offered their followers the opportunity to take some tangible action that, superficially at least, altered their condition.

DOUGMENTS

Introduction

As the family was recast in the generation or so before the Civil War, middle-class men and women faced new expectations, obligations, and roles. A woman was expected to stay home and to take care of the house, her children, and her husband. Men were expected to provide for their families.

These expectations are revealed in the following letters. The first two letters are part of a larger correspondence, in which Joshua Wilson, a Presbyterian minister from Cincinnati, Ohio, and his wife, Sarah, counsel their son, George, on becoming an adult. The two letters included here, signed by Joshua and his daughter (George's sister), Sally, deal with courtship. The last letter is from a planter in eastern North Carolina to his daughter. Against her father's advice, Mary Matilda Norcom married her suitor; her parents disowned her.


Questions for Discussion

1. From the role played by fathers in both sets of letters, and from the expectations about a husband and father's role described and implicit in all the letters, describe the position of the husband and father in the first half of the nineteenth century. Are there any discernable sectional differences between the North and South?

2. The text notes the geographic mobility of Americans. Neither Mary Norcom nor George Wilson was living at home at the time of the correspondence. Did that make any difference in the control parents could exert?

3. In the nineteenth century, most land holdings were too small and too many children survived into adulthood for most families to be able to endow children with substantial patrimonies and dowries. Ja Norcom found his daughter's suitor to be "meritorious and respectable," but he objected to the young man because of the latter's inability to support Mary. Ja Norcom indicated that, had he a fortune to make Mary "independent," he would not have objected to the match. Might not this very situation have limited the authority of the parent?
November 23, 1823

We presume you are already informed that your letter of the 28th was duly received. The delicate and important subject suggested for our consideration form a sufficient reason for some delay that we might not give advice in a matter of such moment without meditation, prayer, and serious conference. It would be very unreasonable for us to attempt to restrain the lawful and laudable desires of our children, all we ought to do is to endeavor to direct and regulate their innocent wishes and curb and conquer those which are vicious. Nor are we ignorant of the great advantages which frequently result from virtuous love and honorable wedlock. But there is a time for all things, and such are the fixed laws of nature that things are only beautiful and useful when they occupy their own time and place. Premature love and marriage are often blighted by the frosts of adversity and satiety leaving hasty lovers to droop in the meridian of life and drag out a miserable existence under the withering influence of disappointment and disgust....We do not say you have been hasty but we wish you to reflect seriously upon this question. Is not the whole affair premature? We know from experience and observation that schemes which appear reasonable and desirable at the age of twenty wear a very different aspect at twenty five. We think it probable that greater maturity, more experience in business and a larger acquaintance with the world might change your views and feelings. Besides we are not sure that you have sufficiently considered the weighty responsibility. We feel no disposition to place any insuperable barrier in your way. Our advice is that you give the subject that consideration which its importance demands, that you unite with us in praying for divine direction, that every thing be done deliberately, decently, orderly, honorably and devoutly.

December 9, 1823

Your letter of Nov 18 has been duly received. On its contents we have meditated with deep solicitude....You seem confident that your decision is not premature nor hasty. Here we feel compelled to demur and beg you to weigh the matter again. You express a hope that before great length of time we shall have an opportunity of receiving Miss B much to our satisfaction. Dear George, it will not be any satisfaction to us to see you place a lady in a more precarious condition than you found her and this we are sure would be the case if marriage with this young lady should take place shortly. We must remind you of a pledge given in your former letter and insist upon its obligation, that you marry no woman without the prospect of supporting her in a suitable manner. Think of the circumstances in which she has been educated, of the circle of society in which she has been accustomed to move, of her delicate constitution and refined sensibility and then imagine to yourself her disappointment upon entering into a poor dependent family occupying an indifferent tenement without the
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means of affording a comfortable lodging or decently accommodating her friends. She has been accustomed to see you in the agreeable aspect of the scholar and a gentleman and she has seen your father also in flattering circumstances. We do not say things to discourage you but to show you the necessity of prudence in your plans, diligence in your studies and such application to business as will afford a reasonable prospect of success before you become the head of a family.
Letter from Ja Norcom to Mary Matilda Norcom (1846)

Edenton, N. C., 19 August 1846
My dear Daughter,

...You must remember, my daughter, what I have said to you, on a certain subject. I would not acknowledge myself to be engaged, affianced, to any man not in a condition to give me a comfortable & respectable support—to place me beyond the chance of want or poverty. I, my dear, could never ratify such an engagement were you to make it. Everything, therefore, in relation to this matter must be conditional. It cannot be positive, for, however meritorious a man may be, & how high he might be in my opinion or esteem, I could not sanction his connexion with a daughter of mine, in the "Holy Estate" with the prospect of poverty & wretchedness before her.

Treat the man who honors you with his partiality & preference with candor, politeness—nay, with kindness, but let him not hope, if he is inconsiderate enough to wish it, to draw you into a situation in which you would be less comfortable than you are in your father's dwelling, or less comfortable than you could be among your friends, in your present condition. W--- is a meritorious and respectable young man, an honour to his family, & worthy of general esteem; and had I a fortune, my daughter, to give you, or the means of making you independent, I see nothing in his character to object to. But his inability to support a family, as long as it lasts, is an insurmountable objection, & of the probability of its removal no correct opinion can now be formed. Time alone can instruct us on the subject. Pray be prudent, my daughter, and do nothing in your absence from us, that you would not do in the presence of your father,

Ja Norcom
At the beginning of the nineteenth century, no jurisdiction in the United States had any statutes regarding abortion. The common law did not recognize the existence of a fetus until quickening (the first perception of fetal movement). Expulsion and destruction of a fetus after quickening was a crime, but one considered to be less serious than destruction of a human life. Before quickening, actions to terminate a fetus were not illegal. Indeed, home medical manuals typically contained information on abortifacients.

The general assembly of Connecticut passed the first antiabortion statute in 1821. Over the next twenty years, thirteen other states passed some form of antiabortion legislation. The primary concern in passing these laws seems to have been the potential danger to the woman of the violent purgatives used as abortifacients. Connecticut's law, for example, was part of the state's criminal code relating to poisoning. Moreover, that law made it a crime to administer the abortifacient only after quickening.

Part of the drive for antiabortion laws came from the medical profession, which understood that conception began a continued process of development that, if not interrupted, led to birth. This recognition had significant consequences for abortion, since the medical profession defended the value of human life per se as an absolute—probably to a greater degree than any other group in American society. In addition, professionalizing physicians worried about competition from nonprofessionals. Thus, if a doctor refused to perform an abortion, a nonprofessional practitioner would gladly do so. In such an event, the physician not only lost the fee for the abortion; he risked losing the woman seeking the abortion as a patient (and perhaps her family as well). For all these reasons, the medical profession tended to oppose abortions at any point in the pregnancy.

The 1840s witnessed significant changes in abortion in the United States. The practice became more public, both through advertising for abortion services and through the press coverage of a number of trials involving botched abortions. In addition, contemporary observers reported an increase in the incidence of abortions. Perhaps even more important, the increase in abortion came, not from an increase in illegitimacy, but from white, married, Protestant, native-born women from the middle and upper classes who wanted to postpone childbearing or who had all the children they wanted.

The preeminent abortion specialist was New York's Ann Lohman, who called herself Madame Restell. She began performing abortions on a commercial scale in the 1830s and gained notoriety in the 1840s, both through advertising and through arrests that resulted in two convictions on minor infractions. Madame Restell employed techniques of modern business; she opened branch offices in Boston and Philadelphia. She also used traveling salesmen to peddle her abortifacient pills. The first two documents are advertisements for Madame Restell's services. The third document is an advertisement for Madame Drunette's "French Lunar Pills." Madame Drunette, who lived in Boston, was a contemporary of Madame Restell and probably competed for business with the latter's Boston office. The fourth document is an advertisement for the services of Catherine Costello, the best-known commercial abortionist in Jersey City, who also competed against Madame Restell in New York.
York City. Costello's husband, Charles Mason, was indicted for selling the corpse of one of his wife's patients.


**Questions for Discussion**

1. What in these advertisements might have aroused concerns of doctors? Do modern physicians ever guarantee the efficacy of a cure?

2. Why do you think Ann Lohman took a French name? Why might Madame Drunette have sold her preparation as "French Lunar Pills"?

3. What pressures would there be on a physician if a female patient asked to be treated for menstrual blockage? What role would advertisements such as Madame Restell's or Madame Costello's have in making that decision?

4. Madame Restell's advertisement in the *Boston Daily Times* (the second document) offers "preventive powders for married ladies in delicate health." What role for women is envisioned in that advertisement?

5. Why (other than the advertised constant attention and care) might abortionists offer their patients a "comfortable temporary home" as part of the services provided?

6. What connection, if any, might there be between the recasting of the family and the move to the cities, on the one hand, and the increase in abortions, on the other?

7. Why might the advertisements for both Madame Restell and Madame Costello contain warnings for "married ladies"?
Advertisement from *New York Sun*, March 3, 1846

**FEMALE MONTHLY PILLS.**

OWING TO THE CELEBRITY, EFFICACY, and invariable success of Madame Restell's Female Monthly Pills in removing female irregularity since their introduction into the United States, now about 7 years, counterfeits and imitations are constantly attempted to be palmed off for the genuine. Cheap, common pills are purchased, put up in different boxes, and called "Female Monthly Pills," with the object of deceiving the simple and unwaried. Since the well known success of Madame Restell in the treatment of complaints arising from female irregularity, numerous imitators, without knowledge, skill or experience, now and then appear, all making pretentions to cure complaints, of the nature of which they are wholly ignorant. It behoves, therefore, to be careful to whom they entrust themselves with indisposition in the treatment which Madame Restell's experience and specifics has been pre-eminently successful.

CAUTION - No "Female Monthly Pills" are genuine except those sold at Madame Restell's Principal office, 148 Grenwich st, and by appointment, 129 Liberty st, New York. Price $1. They can be used by married or single, by following directions. Madame Restell's signature is written on the cover of each box. Boston office, 7 Essex st.

MADAME RESTELL, FEMALE PHYSICIAN, office and residence 148 Grenwich street, between Courtlandt and Liberty st, where she can be consulted with the strictest confidence on complaints incidental to the female frame.

Madame Restell's experience and knowledge in the treatment of cases of female irregularity, is such as to require but a few days to effect a perfect cure. Ladies desiring proper medical attendance will be accommodated during such time with private and respectable board.

Madame Restell would apprise ladies that her medicines will be sent by mail, or by the various expresses, to any part of the city or country. All letters must be post paid, except those containing an enclosure, addressed to box No. 2359 New York, will be attended to.

Boston office No. 7 Essex st. Madame Restell would also apprise ladies that she devotes her personal attention upon them in any part of the city or vicinity.
MADAME RESTELL.

FEMALE PHYSICIAN, is happy in complying with the solicitations of the numerous importunities of those who have tested the efficacy and success of her medicines, as being so especially adapted to female complaints.

Their known celebrity in Female Hospitals of Vienna and Paris, where they have been altogether adopted as well as their adoption in this country, to the exclusion of the many and deleterious compounds heretofore palmed upon their notice, is ample evidence of the estimation in which they are held to make any lengthened advertisements superfluous; it is sufficient to say that her celebrated "FEMALE MONTHLY PILLS," now acknowledged by the medical fraternity to be the only safe, mild and efficient remedy to be depended upon in long standing cases of Supression, irregularity or stoppage of those functions of nature, the neglect of which is the source of such deplorable defects on the female frame, dizziness in the head, disturbed sleep, sallow complexion, and the innumerable frightful effects which sooner or later terminate in incurable consumption.

The married, it is desired necessary to state, must under some circumstances abstain from their use, for reasons contained in the full directions when and how to be used accompanying each box. Price $1.

Females laboring under weakness, debility, fluoral bas, often so destructive and undermining to the health, will obtain instant relief by the use of these Pills.

PREVENTIVE POWDERS, for married ladies in delicate health, the adoption of which has been the means of preserving many an affectionate wife and fond mother from an early and premature grave. Price $5.00 a package. Their nature is most fully explained in a pamphlet entitled "Suggestion to the Married," which can be obtained free of expense, at the office, where ladies will find one of their own sex, conversant with their indisposition, in attendance.

FEMALE MEDICAL OFFICE, No.7 Essex street, Boston. Office hours from 8 A.M. to 8 P.M.

Philadelphia Office, No 7 South Seventh street.
Advertisement from Boston Daily Times, January 8, 1845

FRENCH LUNAR PILLS.

MADAME DRUNETTE, Female Physician, is happy in complying with the urgent solicitations of her friends and patrons who have tested the efficacy of her invaluable medicines that she still remains at the old stand

9 ENDICOTT ST.

where ladies may consult her personally with confidence upon all cases incident to their nature arising from irregularities, suppression, weakness, &c and a cure warranted in all cases where her directions are strictly followed, and furthermore feels warranted in saying from her long personal experience and attention to patients that the

FRENCH LUNAR PILLS

are the only preparation ever discovered that has proved invariably certain in its operations, acting as they do to eradicate all impurities, thereby assisting nature in performing its office. Madame D. particularly cautions females against advertisements of medicines purporting to be in such eminence for the cure of all female complaints, for they originate from the love of money and not sufficient knowledge of medicines to be of use to the patient, but on the contrary of different nature. Married ladies had best consult personally, as a suspension of medicines is at some time necessary as contained in the directions.

FRENCH PREVENTIVE POWDERS for ladies in delicate health; these powders was long used in Europe before their introduction into this country, and have been extensively used in this city with unprecedented success. They can be had only at Madame Drunette's Office, No 9 Endicott street.

P.S. All letters directed to Madame Drunette, No 9 Endicott st, (post paid) will meet with immediate attention.
MADAME COSTELLO
FEMALE PERIODICAL PILLS - GUARANTEED in every case where the monthly periods have become irregular from cold. Their certainty of actions has been long acknowledged by the medical profession, and hundreds that have uselessly tried various boasted remedies. Care is sometimes necessary to their use, though they contain no medicine detrimental to the constitution. Advice gratis to all those who use the Pills, by Madame Costello, 34 Lispenard street, between Walker and Canal, where the pills are sold. Price $1 per box.

MADAME COSTELLO.
FEMALE PHYSICIAN AND GRADUATE AS MIDWIFE - Offers her professional services to the ladies of this city and country. Having had long experience and surprising success in the treatment of diseases incident to her sex, or those suffering from irregularity, that she will be happy to afford a comfortable temporary home at her residence, where they can always have the best medical treatment and the matronly care and nursing, or, if preferred, will wait on and attend them at their own homes until perfectly recovered. Madame C. particularly begs to impress on the minds of the delicate, that she officiates personally in every case, so that hesitation or dread need never to be apprehended.
N.B. - Madame Costello would inform ladies residing out of the city, whose health would not permit them of travelling, that she would devote her personal attendance upon them in any part of the United States, within reasonable distance.
Madame C. can be consulted at her residence, 34 Lispenard st, at all times, and with the strictest regard to the wishes of her patients.
CHAPTER 11

A Democratic Culture

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

In Search of Native Grounds. As the United States grew, it evolved a more distinctive culture. By the middle of the nineteenth century, American culture was clearly an offspring rather than an imitation of European culture. Of American novelists before 1830, only James Fenimore Cooper made successful use of the national heritage. Most American novelists imitated British writers, though none approached the level of their British counterparts. New York emerged as America's literary capital and Washington Irving as its leading light. American painting reached a level comparable to that of Europe, where many of the best American painters still trained. American painters such as West, Copley, Peale, and Stuart excelled as portraitists. In general, American painting was less obviously imitative of European styles than was American literature.

The Romantic View of Life. The romantic movement was a reaction against the Age of Reason. Romantics valued emotion and intuition over pure reason, and they stressed individualism, optimism, patriotism, and ingeniousness. Romanticism fit the mood of nineteenth-century America. Transcendentalism, a mystical, intuitive way of looking at life that aspired to go beyond the world of the senses, represented the fullest expression of romanticism. Transcendentalists regarded nature as the essence of divinity. Thus, humans were divine because they were part of nature. Above all, transcendentalists valued the individual and the aspiration to stretch beyond human capacities.

Emerson and Thoreau. Ralph Waldo Emerson, the leading transcendentalist thinker, urged Americans to put aside their devotion to things European and seek inspiration in their immediate surroundings. Although he favored change and believed in progress, the new industrial society of New England disturbed him profoundly. However, he was not temperamentally disposed to join crusades for reform. For one thing, he was too idealistic to accept the compromises most reformers must make to achieve their ends. Emerson valued self-reliance and disliked powerful governments. Like Emerson, Henry David Thoreau objected to society's restrictions on the individual. Thoreau spent two years living alone in a cabin at Walden Pond to prove that an individual need not depend on society. To protest the Mexican War, which he believed immoral because it advanced the cause of slavery, Thoreau refused to pay his state poll tax. For this action, he was arrested and spent a night in jail. His essay, "Civil Disobedience," explained his view on the proper relation of the individual to the state.
Edgar Allan Poe. Poe epitomized the romantic image of the tortured genius. Haunted by alcohol, melancholia, hallucinations, and debt, he was nevertheless a master short story writer and poet, a penetrating critic, and an excellent magazine editor. Although he died at forty, he still managed to produce a large volume of serious, highly original work.

Nathaniel Hawthorne. Hawthorne rejected the egoism and optimism of transcendentalism. He was fascinated by New England's Puritan past and its continuing influence on his own time. His best known works, including The Scarlet Letter and The House of the Seven Gables, concerned individuals and their struggle with sin, guilt, and the pride and isolation that often afflict those who place too much reliance on their own judgment.

Herman Melville. Like Hawthorne, Melville could not accept the transcendentalists' optimism. He considered their vague talk about striving and their faith in the goodness of humanity complacent nonsense. In his most famous work, Moby Dick, Melville dealt powerfully with the problems of good and evil, courage and cowardice, faith, stubbornness, and pride.

Walt Whitman. The most romantic and distinctively American writer of his age, Whitman believed that a poet could best express himself by relying uncritically on his natural inclinations. His greatest work, Leaves of Grass, often shocked or confused his readers with its commonplace subject matter and its coarse language.

The Wider Literary Renaissance. The pre-Civil War literary renaissance also included New Englanders Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, John Greenleaf Whittier, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and James Russell Lowell. Southern literature was even more markedly romantic than that of New England, as demonstrated by the novels of John Pendleton Kennedy and William Gilmore Simms. Several historians achieved prominence during this period, including George Bancroft and Francis Parkman. These historians wrote for a wide audience and contributed to the intellectual vitality of the era.

Domestic Tastes. Charles Bulfinch's "Federal" style of architecture flourished in the North. Wood-turning machinery contributed to the popularity of the "Gothic" style. "Greek" and "Italian" styles also flourished, the former particularly in the South. New technology allowed the mass production of textiles with complicated designs, including wallpaper, rugs, and hangings. Combined with the use of machine methods in the production of furniture, new textiles had a profound impact on furniture in American homes. More affluent Americans decorated their homes with the works of American genre painters, "luminists," and members of the Hudson River School. Beginning in the 1850s, the lithographs of Currier and Ives brought a fairly crude but charming form of art to a still wider audience.

Education for Democracy. The common school movement, led by Henry Barnard and Horace Mann, urged the creation of state-administered schools taught by professional teachers. The movement was based on an unquenchable faith in the improvability of the human race through education and a belief that democracy required an educated citizenry. By the 1850s, every state outside the South provided free elementary schools and supported
institutions to train teachers. Historians have identified several reasons for the success of the common school movement. Common schools helped to "Americanize" immigrant children, and they brought Americans of different economic circumstances and ethnic backgrounds into early and mutually beneficial contact with one another. They also instilled good employee values.

**Reading and the Dissemination of Culture.** As the population grew and became more concentrated, and as middle-class values permeated American society, particularly in the North, popular concern for "culture" increased. Industrialization made it possible to satisfy this new demand. Improved printing techniques reduced the cost of books, magazines, and newspapers. Moralistic and sentimental "domestic" novels reached their peak of popularity in the 1850s. Americans devoured reams of religious literature. Self-improvement books were popular as well. Philanthropists established libraries and public lectures. Mutual improvement societies known as lyceums founded libraries, sponsored lectures, and lobbied for better education.

**The State of the Colleges.** The cost of private colleges meant that relatively few students could afford them. Since students were hard to come by, discipline and academic standards were lax. The college curriculum focused on the classics rather than on practical or scientific studies. Colleges began to reform the curriculum in the 1840s. Harvard and Yale established schools of science; Harvard allowed students to choose some of their courses, and instituted grades. Colleges in the South and West began to offer mechanical and agricultural subjects. Oberlin College admitted women in 1837, and the Georgia Female College opened in 1839. White males, however, constituted the overwhelming majority of students. Nevertheless, only 2 percent of white males went to college.

**Civic Cultures.** Cities and towns sought to become local and regional centers of learning, art, and culture. In the East, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia vied for primacy. In the West, Cincinnati, Lexington, and Pittsburgh sought to become regional centers of culture. Members of the professions were generally accepted as the arbiters of taste in cultural matters.

**American Humor.** The juxtaposition of high ideals and low reality formed the basis for much American humor. A newspaperman from New England, Seba Smith, used his fictional character, Major Jack Downing, to provide a satirical lens through which to examine Jacksonian America. Southwestern humor tended towards sometimes violent and ribald tall tales.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The appeal of romanticism for Americans.
2. The main ideas of transcendentalism.
4. What distinguished Melville and Hawthorne from the Transcendentalists.
5. The various reasons for the success of the common school movement.
6. How technology contributed to the spread of culture.
7. Why and how the college curriculum changed in the first half of the nineteenth century.
8. Why some historians have noted a decline in American scientific contributions after the Revolutionary period.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Why was American painting less imitative of Europe than American writing?
2. The United States was founded on principles derived from the Enlightenment. Given that romanticism was a reaction against the Age of Reason, why did romantic ideas so capture the minds of Americans in the early nineteenth century?
3. In evaluating whether or not there was an “American Renaissance” (see the Debating the Past” section), does it matter if Melville and Whitman were widely read in their own day?
4. The people who frequented Central Park in New York used it in ways very different from those envisioned by the architects of the park (see the “Mapping the Past” section). What kinds of people imagined and planned the park? What kind of people used it? What conclusions might the experience of Central Park lead one to draw about social planning?
LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

As the text notes, the romantic movement had a profound impact on American literature and thought of the early nineteenth century. The chapter discusses several ways in which romanticism influenced American writing. Perhaps even more interesting, however, was the reaction to romanticism one finds in the works of Hawthorne and Melville.

Two important themes appear frequently in English romantic literature (which had the most direct influence on American writers): the quest and the Byronic hero. The quest provided a central motif for much romantic literature on both sides of the Atlantic. The romantic quest was a search for something normally considered unattainable by mere mortals. A related theme was that of the Byronic hero, so-named for Byron's frequent and dramatic treatment of the hero on a great quest. Since the quest was for something beyond the grasp of ordinary mortals, the Byronic hero was by definition greater than other men (and they were always men). Frequently, however, in his attempt to achieve his goal, the Byronic hero made a pact with some evil force. Thus, the hero's ability, passion, suffering, and his sin exceeded those of ordinary men. Byron's Manfred was the archetype of this character.

By the time romanticism crossed the Atlantic to America, there had already been a darkening of the romantic vision. Keats in particular, but even Byron and Shelley as well, began to consider a darker side of the romantic quest. Perhaps inspiration, passion, or a quest could become all-consuming. In spite of the basic optimism of the romantics and their belief in unlimited human potential, some romantic writers began to wonder if these possibilities could be realized and therefore whether the quest could be fulfilled.

More important, writers like Hawthorne and Melville questioned whether the quest was worthwhile in the first place. Their work explored the cost of the search for the Holy Grail—both to the quester and to society—and the consequences of failure, which they considered inevitable. Unlike their romantic predecessors, Hawthorne and Melville distrusted nature; they liked society, and they often put the cost of the quest in societal terms. In their works, the quester wound up isolated from society, which symbolized a loss of the capability to feel. A prime example would be Captain Ahab of Melville's *Moby Dick*.

In many ways, Ahab is a classic Byronic hero—a man of great stature and pride, whose pride leads to a compact with the devil. Ahab aspires to do what ordinary mortals cannot—kill the great white whale—and he enlists the powers of evil to do so. When Ahab tempers the harpoon with which he hopes to kill the great white whale, he says: "Ergo non baptizo te in nomine patris sed in nomine diaboli" (I baptize you not in the name of the father but in the name of the devil). To this point, Ahab closely resembles Byron's Manfred.

The whale's forehead, which Melville describes as the "pasteboard mask," symbolizes the limits beyond which humans should not go. Ahab tries to strike beyond those limits, indeed to destroy them. In the process, he dooms himself and others to death. Ahab's harpoon symbolically sinks into the whale's forehead, and Ahab gets tangled in the line and dragged to his death. In pursuit of his quest, Ahab destroys not only himself but his ship and his crew (his community). In contrast to Ahab, Ishmael, the narrator, sees the whale as a mystery and stops there. Therein lies the key to his survival.

Melville's masterful story, "Bartleby the Scrivener," also deals with the aspiration to reach beyond mortal bounds. In this story, walls replace the whale's forehead as the symbol of humanity's limits. (The story's subtitle is "A Tale of Wall Street.") Bartleby is fascinated
by walls. He stares at them in endless contemplation. As a result, he cannot function in society. Ultimately, Bartleby is imprisoned not by society, but by himself, by his own preoccupation, and he dies staring at prison walls. Unlike Ahab, he does not try to strike beyond the barrier, rather he is frozen by it (Melville's ultimate negation of the Byronic hero). Bartleby's preoccupation with the walls isolates him from society and makes it impossible for other people (in this case, the story's narrator) to help him.

Hawthorne's short stories in particular reflect similar concerns. For Hawthorne, no one is free from sin. The greatest sin, the original sin, is intellectual pride. As a result of the quest to master man and nature through intellect, Hawthorne's characters lose love and compassion. For Hawthorne, community is important, and the romantic quest estranges the quester from his community.

In "Young Goodman Brown," Hawthorne creates an inversion of the quest. Young Goodman Brown goes off on a journey in the forest and sees all the holy people of the town cavorting with the devil. Symbolically, he learns the simple but profound truth that evil lurks in everyone's soul. In learning this secret, however, Young Goodman Brown has struck beyond the prescribed bounds. He cannot return to society, and he cannot be happy. He lives a long life, or rather a death in life, as a "stern, sad, darkly meditative, distrustful, if not desperate man."

The young minister of "The Minister's Black Veil" undergoes a similar experience. One day he takes to wearing a black veil over his face. The minister has looked inside himself, a typical romantic quest, but in doing so he saw something so traumatic that he cannot deal with it. He must make some outward sign. This exploration of the subconscious was a common focus for the romantic quest; earlier romantics often portrayed it as a search for inspiration. Hawthorne follows the pattern; the minister's experience makes him a better preacher. Indeed, Hawthorne describes the minister's funereal prayer for a young man as music from a "heavenly harp." At the same time, however, the experience results in his permanent isolation from society. Like Young Goodman Brown, the minister is doomed to a long life of isolation and torment.

This pulling back from the optimism and enthusiasm of the early romantics later found expression in the French symbolist and English Victorian writers. The themes they explored, however, were first fully developed by Hawthorne and Melville.

Aside from their place in world literature, Hawthorne and Melville represented an important stage in American intellectual development. Earlier writers such as Cooper glorified the individual on the frontier. Hawthorne and Melville reflected the concerns of a growing and increasingly urban and civilized country. Cooper's sympathies, like those of the English romantics, rested squarely on the side of the individual. Hawthorne and Melville suggested the need for finding a way of living in a community, as a part of a society. In short, they performed the greatest task of intellectuals: they defined the moral agenda for their society.
DOCUMENTS

Introduction

As the text points out, the college curriculum and college life changed dramatically during the first half of the nineteenth century. The first two documents are letters from a student at Princeton, Charles C. Jones, Jr., to his parents. Charles's father, Rev. C. C. Jones, and his family were gentlefolk in South Carolina. A fire burned their house to the ground. At roughly that time, Rev. Jones received the offer of a position with the Board of Domestic Missions in Philadelphia. He accepted the offer (which he regarded as providential), moved his family to Philadelphia, and sent his sons to Princeton to complete their educations.

The third document is Emma Willard's pamphlet, An Address to the Public, Particularly to the Members of the Legislature of New-York, Proposing a Plan for Improving Female Education. It presents a powerful defense of educating women. Willard was an experienced teacher who tried to convince the New York legislature to fund state-supported schools for girls.


Questions for Discussion

1. What courses is Charles Jones, Jr., taking? How do his studies relate to the educational reform described in the text?

2. What sense of college life do the letters Jones wrote home give? Why might these letters not portray college life in all its manifestations?
3. On what grounds does Willard argue for the education of women? How might the argument of separate spheres, which could be used to support certain rights for women, be used against women? Was this the best way to frame arguments for women's rights? Was it the most practical way to frame such arguments?
Princeton, Monday, November 18th, 1850

My Dear Parents,

...We are engaged in quietly—yet I am persuaded faithfully—meeting the regular routine of college duties, and are deriving much improvement from the same. Our professor of belles-lettres delivered an excellent lecture last Thursday to the junior class, the object of which was to suggest some practical hints in regard to a course of reading. He adopts the opinion of Lord Bacon, which is that "Some few books are to be chewed and digested, while the majority should only be tasted," recommending us to select some particular subject in which we feel deeply interested, to trace every other which flows from or bears any relation to it, and thence draw our own conclusion as well as preserve the thoughts suggested by its investigation.

He cited an example of the Reformation. Just fix the date 1520. Next, Luther appears as the great champion of this revolution in the religion and feelings of the Old World, together with his co-workers, such as Zwingli, Melancthon, etc. Then we are led to inquire into the principles of Leo X, the present Pope of Rome. We are now introduced to Tetzel and become acquainted with his several acts, such as the sale of indulgences: the effect produced by these upon the popular mind. Charles V next demands our attention, and through him we are introduced to Ferdinand and Isabella. Thence the fall of Granada, the expulsion of the Moors from Spain, the discovery of America, and other incidents of a similar character....

Thus we see how many events fraught with intense interest cling around that single date of 1520. It is by fixing our minds upon particular eras similar to this, by associating with them the most illustrious personages who then figured on the stage of action, and by tracing with a scrutinizing eye the several effects which each of them caused, that we fix any subject deeply and permanently, and derive that lasting, solid benefit which should be expected from a profitable course of reading. He advises to read with a pen in hand, not for the purpose of engaging in the pernicious habit of copying, but for the sake of marking whatever is valuable, and with a view to improvement....In this lecture I found much which was but a rehearsal of those valuable teachings which in early youth I received from your lips....

Your Affectionate son,

Charles C. Jones, Jr.
Princeton, Friday, April 11, 1851

My very dear Parents,

As the examination, which has continued all this week, is now completed, I will do myself the pleasure of conversing with you for an hour or two. One of the peculiar privileges which man enjoys is that, although far removed from those we love, still every facility is afforded of a speedy and untrammeled intercourse....

Since our return to Princeton we have been busily engaged in reviewing for the quarterly examination, and have in this way found much to enlist the attention....In consequence of our visit to Philadelphia I was not able to review the differential calculus as carefully as I might have. Still, here I succeeded pretty well, and in the remaining studies as much so as could be desired.

The faculty have held more meetings this week than in any four or five previous. This was not without a cause, nor wanting an effect; for several of the students have received walking tickets, or rather traveling passports...Several others are in much trepidation of soul in regard to their fate....So much for college sprees, drinking, etc....

Your affectionate son,

Charles C. Jones, Jr.
Institutions for young gentlemen are founded by public authority, and are permanent; they are endowed with funds, and their instructors and overseers, are invested with authority to make such laws, as they shall deem most salutary....With their funds they procure libraries, philosophical apparatus, and other advantages....Female schools present the reverse of this. Wanting permanency, and dependent on individual patronage, had they wisdom to make salutary regulations, they could neither enforce nor purchase compliance. The pupils are irregular in their times of entering and leaving school....

...female education has not yet been systematized. Chance and confusion reign here. Not even is youth considered in our sex, as in the other, a season which should be wholly devoted to improvement. Among families, so rich as to be entirely above labour, the daughters are hurried through the routine of boarding school instruction, and at an early period introduced into the gay world....Mark the different treatment, which the sons of these families receive. While their sisters are gliding through the mazes of the midnight dance, they employ the lamp, to treasure up for future use the riches of ancient wisdom....When the youth of two sexes has been spent so differently, it is strange, or is nature in fault, if more mature age has brought such a difference of character, that our sex have been considered by the other as the pampered, wayward babies of society, who must have some rattle put into our hands, to keep us from doing mischief to ourselves or others?

...It is the duty of a government to do all in its power to promote the present and future prosperity of the nation, over which it is placed. This prosperity will depend on the character of its citizens. The characters of these will be formed by their mothers....If this is the case, then it is the duty of our present legislators to begin now, to form the characters of the next generation, by controlling that of the females, who are to be their mothers, while it is yet with them a season of improvement.

...it is not a masculine education which is here recommended...a female institution might possess the respectability, permanency, and uniformity of operation of those appropriated to males, and yet differ from them, so as to be adapted to that difference of character and duties, to which the softer sex should be formed....
CHAPTER 12

Westward Expansion

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Tyler’s Troubles. Tyler clashed continuously with Clay, who considered himself the real leader of the Whig party. Clay’s comprehensive program, which included a new Bank of the United States, conflicted with Tyler’s view of states’ rights. When Tyler vetoed a bill to create a new Bank, the entire cabinet, except for Webster, resigned. Clay wanted to distribute the proceeds of land sales to the states to justify raising the tariff. Southerners insisted on stopping distribution if the tariff exceeded 20 percent. When the Whigs attempted to push a high tariff through Congress without repealing the Distribution Act, Tyler vetoed the bill. Finally, after repeal of the Distribution Act, Tyler signed a bill providing for a higher tariff.

The Webster-Ashburton Treaty. The boundary between Maine and New Brunswick had remained unsettled since 1783. In order to avoid a serious conflict over the disputed area, Secretary of State Webster and Lord Ashburton negotiated a settlement. Although the United States gave up some of its rightful claims in that area, the British made concessions elsewhere along the U.S.-Canadian border.

The Texas Question. The Transcontinental Treaty of 1819 excluded Texas from the United States. Americans nevertheless soon began to settle in the area, which had become part of an independent Mexico. Before long, American settlers far outnumbered Mexicans in Texas. Both Adams and Jackson tried to buy Texas, but Mexico refused to sell. Disagreements arose between the American settlers and the Mexican government over religion, language, and slavery, which led the Mexican government to prohibit further immigration of Americans. In response, Texans began to seek independence. A series of skirmishes escalated into rebellion. Texas declared its independence in 1836, and Sam Houston was elected its first president. Although opinion in Texas favored annexation by the United States, Jackson and Van Buren wanted neither war with Mexico nor to stir up sectional tensions by admitting Texas as a state. Texas developed friendly relations with Britain, which alarmed southerners, who worried that Texas might abolish slavery. In an effort to insure the annexation of Texas, Tyler appointed Calhoun secretary of state. Calhoun’s association with the extreme southern viewpoint and with slavery alienated many northerners who otherwise would have favored the annexation of Texas, and the Senate rejected Calhoun’s treaty.

Manifest Destiny. By the 1840s, Americans had come to believe that it was their destiny to explore, settle, and exploit the entire continent and to unify it into one nation.
Life on the Trail. Later generations romanticized westward expansion; in reality, the movement entailed hardship, danger, and death. In the 1840s, the trip west covered a longer distance than in earlier days. Moreover, the comforts of "civilization" were more extensive than in earlier times, and therefore harder to surrender. The move west disrupted family life and gender roles. Much of the hardship fell on women.

California and Oregon. Many settlers traveled to California, then unmistakably part of Mexico, and to Oregon, which both the United States and Britain claimed. In the 1840s, Americans regarded Oregon as a particularly desirable destination. The expense of the trip meant that few who went west were genuinely poor. The allure of Pacific coast harbors, which some regarded as the keys to the Asian trade, also drew people westward.

The Election of 1844. The Whigs nominated Clay. Van Buren wanted to keep Texas out of the campaign, but southern Democrats rallied behind Calhoun's policy of annexing Texas as a slave state. Van Buren lost control of the Democratic convention, which nominated James K. Polk of Tennessee. A Jacksonian Democrat who opposed both high tariffs and a national bank, Polk favored expansionism. The antislavery Liberty party split the Whig vote in New York and handed the election to Polk. In spite of Polk's narrow victory, many regarded it as a mandate for expansion. Tyler called for a joint resolution of Congress to annex Texas, and it passed just before Tyler left the White House.

Polk as President. Polk was uncommonly successful in carrying out his policies. He persuaded Congress to lower the tariff of 1842 and to restore the Independent Treasury. He also succeeded in opposing federal internal improvements. Polk acquired Oregon in a treaty with Britain, which ended the joint occupation of the territory and established the 49th parallel as the boundary between Canada and the United States from the Rockies to Puget Sound (except for Vancouver Island, which the British retained).

War with Mexico. When the United States annexed Texas, Mexico broke off diplomatic relations. Polk ordered General Zachary Taylor to defend the disputed border region between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande. Polk also sent John Slidell on a secret mission to Mexico to try to obtain the disputed area by negotiation. The Mexicans rejected Polk's offer to buy the territory in question as well as part of New Mexico and California. Mexico also reasserted its claim to all of Texas. A Mexican attack on American troops north of the Rio Grande provided Polk with the pretext to declare war. Although smaller, the American force was better led and supplied. The outcome of the war was never in doubt.

To the Halls of Montezuma. Polk demonstrated real ability as a military planner, but domestic opposition to the war (particularly in the North) and the fact that his leading generals were Whigs hampered his conduct of the war. Taylor quickly occupied northern Mexico, and settlers led by John C. Frémont established an independent Republic of California. American troops under Winfield Scott landed near Veracruz and advanced toward Mexico City. Amid the hardest fighting of the war, Scott's forces advanced into Mexico City.
The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Polk sent Nicholas P. Trist to serve as peace commissioner. Trist proceeded to negotiate the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, in which Mexico agreed to accept the Rio Grande as its border with Texas and to cede New Mexico and Upper California to the United States. In return, the United States agreed to pay Mexico $15 million and to take on the claims of American citizens against Mexico. Polk hoped for a better deal, but he had no choice but to submit the treaty to the Senate, for to demand more territory would have meant the continuation of an increasingly unpopular war. For similar reasons, the Senate ratified it.

The Fruits of Victory: Further Enlargement of the United States. The Mexican War resulted in enormous territorial gains for the United States. In 1848, gold was discovered near San Francisco. The ensuing gold rush accelerated settlement of the Pacific coast.

Slavery: The Fire Bell in the Night Rings Again. Territorial expansion raised the unresolved issue of the status of slavery in the new territories. The Constitution did not give the federal government any control over slavery in the states, but Congress had complete authority in the territories. During the Mexican War, Congressman David Wilmot proposed an amendment prohibiting slavery in any territory acquired from Mexico. The Wilmot Proviso passed the House but not the Senate, where southerners held the balance of power. Calhoun countered by introducing resolutions that argued that Congress had no right to bar slavery from any territory. Two compromises were offered. Polk and most southerners supported a plan to extend the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific. Senator Lewis Cass proposed letting local settlers determine the issue of slavery in their territory (popular sovereignty).

The Election of 1848. Both parties hedged on the issue of slavery. The Whigs nominated a war hero, Zachary Taylor, and the Democrats nominated Lewis Cass. The Van Buren wing of the Democratic party, known as "Barnburners," combined with the Liberty party to form the antislavery Free Soil party and nominated Van Buren. Taylor won the election by a narrow margin, but the Free Soil party garnered about 10 percent of the vote.

The Gold Rush. Between 1849 and 1860, over 200,000 people went to California in search of gold. The massive immigration reduced California's Spanish population to a minority. Order was difficult to maintain among large numbers of men seeking fortunes and isolated from women. Ethnic conflict contributed to the disorder. Taylor proposed admitting California directly as a state and letting Californians decide for themselves about slavery. Californians drew up a constitution that outlawed slavery, which outraged southerners. The admission of California as a free state would tip the balance in the Senate in favor of the North.

The Compromise of 1850. Clay proposed a compromise. California would be brought directly into the Union as a free state, and the rest of the Southwest would be organized as a territory without mention of slavery. Southerners would retain the right to bring slaves into the Southwest Territory. Texas would give up its claims to disputed land along its border with New Mexico; in exchange, the United States would take over Texas' preannexation
debts. The slave trade would be abolished in the District of Columbia (although not slavery itself), and Congress would pass a more effective fugitive slave law. Clay's proposals led to one of the greatest debates in the history of the Senate. Calhoun demanded that the North yield on every point and argued for the right of states to secede peacefully from the Union. Webster defended Clay's proposals. Taylor's death and Fillmore's assumption of the presidency paved the way for compromise. Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois pushed each measure separately through the Senate.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The factors that led both the United States and Great Britain to agree to the Webster-Ashburton Treaty.

2. What led Texans to rebel against Mexican rule.

3. The concept of manifest destiny and its impact on American foreign policy.

4. The impact of Texas on the election of 1844.

5. The settlement of the dispute over Oregon.

6. Events leading to the war with Mexico.

7. The importance of the issue of slavery in the territories.

8. The Wilmot Proviso.

9. The concept of popular sovereignty.

10. Sectional divisions between the Whig and Democratic parties.

11. The circumstances leading up to and the provisions of the Compromise of 1850.

**POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION**

1. In what ways were the issues of slavery, Texas, and the Mexican War interrelated?

2. Is the text correct in suggesting that slavery could not be extended to Arizona and New Mexico?

3. What issues did the Compromise of 1850 leave unsettled?
2. Discuss the relationship between fertility rates and cheap land (consult the “Mapping the Past” section). What other factors influenced fertility?

3. Compare the changing historical interpretations of women’s roles on the frontier (see the “Debating the Past” section) with development in modern feminist thought.

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The text discusses life on the trail and the lure of California and Oregon. Not only did many people head for the Pacific coast, but many people settled in the Midwest and became farmers. Especially after railroads linked Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Missouri to eastern markets, these farms became commercially oriented and emerged as part of the national market. Expanding agriculture provided food for America's growing cities and most of America's foreign exchange in the nineteenth century.

A virtual revolution in farm technology accompanied the general shift to commercial farming in the 1850s. Although invented in the 1830s, the steel plow, drill, reaper, mower, and thresher did not become commonly available until the 1850s. The basic technology of the farm remained hand tools. The chopping ax, broadax, frow, auger, and plane enabled farmers to make farm implements such as hoes, rakes, sickles, scythes, cradles, flails, and plows. Local blacksmiths provided the ironwork.

Available technology limited the number of acres a family could cultivate. The only way to increase the limit was to add field hands. A family with two economically active males could cultivate about fifty acres. Of that area, typically one acre was devoted to the home garden, perhaps twenty to small grain crops, and the remainder to corn. Bare survival required about half an acre for the family garden, another half acre for grain, and about ten acres in corn.

An ox or yoke of oxen was really essential, although some families made do with a working cow. However, cows provided necessary milk, and working them reduced dairy production. A few sheep provided wool. Geese and ducks provided down and were occasionally butchered. The primary supply of meat came from chickens and a herd of swine.

Life on a farm was hard, especially in the early years of settlement. Even after the first years of material hardship, life for a midwestern farmer remained isolated. These farms could not, however, produce all their necessities, so trades and crafts supplemented farm income and provided interaction with the rural towns. Moreover, commercialization and production for urban markets also contributed to social intercourse.

This sort of farm sustained a style of life and level of consumption close to the level of comfort contemporaries enjoyed. It provided everything for the table except coffee, rice, salt, and spices. Farmers also needed to buy shoes, metal for farm implements, and occasional dry goods. The small trading surplus of the farm provided for these.

The family functioned as the central economic unit. Tasks were divided and labor apportioned by family patterns. The principal division of labor was by sex. Men cleared land, if the family took up on wooded ground. New land, especially prairie sod, often
required a breaking plow pulled by a yoke of oxen. Work in cleared and plowed fields also fell to men. Men and boys harrowed, weeded, and harvested. Men also had responsibility for repairing farm implements and taking care of draft animals. In addition, hogs and sheep were tended by men or boys, who also did the butchering. Hunting played a less significant role in providing for the family, but this activity continued to hold a special place in the development of a male identity.

Women played at least as central a role in providing subsistence. They tended to the domestic garden, the henhouse, and dairy. Women kept enough chickens to provide eggs, both for the family table and for market, as well as to provide a new flock of roasters. Care of dairy cows and milking occupied a central place in the daily routine. Making butter and cheese were also important tasks. Few made ripened cheeses, but nearly all women made cottage cheese and farmer's cheese. Food preparation also fell to the women, who prepared three heavy meals a day. Most farm wives spent the entire morning cooking. Cleaning the house and caring for bedding was also women's work. Women spun and wove wool, cotton, and flax. They also made the family's clothing. In addition to washing clothes, women made their own soap.

Women also bore and raised the children. The average family in the Midwest had between five and six children. Miscarriages, stillbirths, and infant mortality drained the energies and emotions of women. One in five children died before his or her fifth birthday, and prenatal losses were at least as high.

In some areas, men and women worked together. Women aided in the butchering, made sausage, prepared hams for curing, and cooked the ribs. Making cider or apple butter and rendering maple sugar were two other occasions on which men and women worked together. The demands of planting sometimes called women into the fields.

John Mack Faragher has suggested that, however the work was actually distributed, men's work connected the family to a larger social process, the market. Women's work remained hidden by the draperies.

DOCUMENTS

Introduction

The "great debate" over the Compromise of 1850 was one of the most extraordinary moments in the history of the Senate and, indeed, of the United States. Powerful orators eloquently defended their causes. The triumvirate of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster, who had dominated legislative politics for a generation, gave their last great performances. Younger politicians such as Stephen Douglas and William Henry Seward, who would shape the politics of the next decade, grasped for leadership. The nation tottered on the brink of disunion, but both sides stared into the chasm and pulled back.

The first document is Clay's response to Thomas Hart Benton, who opposed lumping the admission of California with other issues. Benton insisted that each issue receive consideration on its merits and be voted on separately. Clay's response defended his compromise package.

The second document is Calhoun's impassioned defense of the southern cause. Only four weeks from death and too ill to read it himself, Calhoun sat and listened while Senator James Mason of Virginia read it for him.


Questions for Discussion

1. What is Clay's position on secession? How does it differ from Calhoun's?

2. One observer has noted that "Calhoun thought his plan would save the Union, but his speech was an argument for secession." In what ways does Calhoun's speech bear this out?

3. One could make the case that Clay's speech is an argument for process over content. Calhoun clearly places content ahead of process. Which, if either, is more suitable to a democracy? Are there times when issues must take precedence over procedures?

4. Given the demographic and economic developments of mid-century, how reasonable were Calhoun's fears of northern domination?
Clay's Reply to Benton (1850)

Mr. President, although far from being well, suffering still under the common malady of the times—the influenza, I suppose—I feel myself called upon to make some reply to a portion of the arguments which we have just heard from the Senator from Missouri. Sir, I have to express an unfeigned regret that it is not my fortune to concur in opinion with that Senator in reference to the mode of accomplishing a common object which we both have very much at heart....

Mr. President, I stated on Friday last, and I have on various occasions stated, that, for one, I was ready to vote for the admission of California separately, by itself and unconnected with any other measures, or in conjunction with other measures. And I stated on that occasion to the Senate and to the Senator from Missouri, that I believed, as I yet believe, that the most speedy mode of accomplishing the object which both he and I have in view, is by combining some of these measures in connection with California, and by this combined bill presenting subjects, which I shall presently show are fairly connected in their nature, to the consideration of Congress at one and the same time. The whole question between the Senator from Missouri and myself, is which is the best mode of accomplishing the object. I say connect the several measures together; he says no, take California separately and alone....We all know perfectly well that there are large majorities in both Houses in favor of the admission of California. We know at the same time that there are great difficulties with reference to the passage of territorial government unconnected with the Wilmot Proviso. We know that one portion of Congress desires very much the admission of California, when many members comprising that portion are opposed-some to the establishment of any governments at all for the territories, and many of them to the establishment of such governments without the introduction of the proviso....And, besides, there are those who desire the establishment of governments for the territories without the proviso, but who are willing to take the admission of California in combination with governments for the territories without the proviso....I did hear—as we know has occurred once at least on one day during this session—that if it was attempted to force on the minority of that House a measure which is unacceptable to it, and abhorrent to its feelings, without its association with other objects in view, that minority would resort, in resistance of it, not I trust to acts of violence, but to those parliamentary rules and modes of proceeding of which we have had before instances in this country, and which I myself witnessed forty years ago, in a most remarkable degree, in the House of Representatives, and which we know some consider lawful at any time to be employed. For myself, I...am for trial of mind against mind, of argument against argument, of reason against reason, and when, after such employment of our intellectual faculties, I find myself in the minority, I am for submitting to the act of the majority....

The purpose of the committee is to settle, if they can, the causes of difference which exist in the country by some proposition of compromise...I go for honorable compromise whenever it can be made....Compromise is peculiarly appropriate among the members of a republic...
I have, Senators, believed from the first that the agitation of the subject of slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion....The agitation has been permitted to proceed, with almost no attempt to resist it, until it has reached a period when it can no longer be disguised or denied that the Union is in danger. You have thus had forced upon you the greatest and the gravest question that can ever come under your consideration: How can the Union be preserved?

...The first question, then, presented for consideration, in the investigation I propose to make, in order to obtain such knowledge, is: What is it that has endangered the Union?

To this question there can be but one answer: that the immediate cause is the almost universal discontent which pervades all the States composing the southern section of the Union....

It is a great mistake to suppose, as is by some, that it originated with demagogues....No; some cause, far deeper and more powerful than the one supposed must exist to account for discontent so wide and deep. The question, then, recurs: What is the cause of this discontent? It will be found in the belief of the people of the southern States, as prevalent as the discontent itself, that they cannot remain, as things now are, consistently with honor and safety, in the Union. The next question to be considered is: What has caused this belief?

One of the causes is, undoubtedly, to be traced to the long-continued agitation of the slave question on the part of the North, and the many aggressions which they have made on the rights of the South during the time....

There is another, lying back of it, with which this is intimately connected, that may be regarded as the great and primary cause. That is to be found in the fact that the equilibrium between the two sections in the Government, as it stood when the constitution was ratified and the Government put in action has been destroyed. At that time there was nearly a perfect equilibrium between the two, which afforded ample means to each to protect itself against the aggression of the other; but, as it now stands, one section has the exclusive power of controlling the Government, which leaves the other without any adequate means of protecting itself against its encroachment and oppression....

[The] great increase of Senators, added to the great increase of the House of Representatives and the electoral college on the part of the North, which must take place under the next decade, will effectually and irretrievably destroy the equilibrium which existed when the Government commenced....

What was once a constitutional Federal Republic is now converted, in reality, into one as absolute as that of the Autocrat of Russia, and as despotic in its tendency as any absolute Government that ever existed.

As, then, the North has the absolute control over the Government, it is manifest that on all questions between it and the South, where there is a diversity of interests, the interests of the latter will be sacrificed to the former, however oppressive the effects may be....But if there was no question of vital importance to the South, in reference to which there was a diversity of views between the two sections, this state of things might be endured without the hazard of destruction to the South. But such is not the fact....
I refer to the relation between the two races in the southern section, which constitutes a vital portion of her social organization. Every portion of the North entertains views and feelings more or less hostile to it.

If the agitation goes on, the same force, acting with increased intensity, as has been shown, will finally snap every cord, when nothing will be left to bind the States together except force.

How can the Union be saved? To this I answer, there is but one way by which it can be, and that is by adopting such measures as will satisfy the States belonging to the southern section that they can remain in the Union consistently with their honor and their safety.
CHAPTER 13

The Sections Go Their Ways

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The South. The South was less affected than other regions by urbanization, European immigration, the transportation revolution, and industrialization. The South remained predominantly agricultural; however, the cultivation of cotton and tobacco expanded westward while the older sections of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina diversified their agriculture. Experiments with fertilizers, crop rotation, agricultural implements and practices, and new varieties of crops helped improve agricultural productivity.

The Economics of Slavery. The increased importance of cotton in the South's economy strengthened slavery's hold on the region. The price of slaves increased, particularly in the Deep South, and slave trading became a big business. The slave trade had disastrous effects on slaves; families were often separated. As slaves became more expensive, ownership of slaves became more concentrated. By 1860, only 25 percent of southern families owned any slaves. Relatively speaking, the South had few large plantations and many small farms. Small farms grew staple crops and owned few slaves. Plantations could yield high profits, but southerners did not develop facilities for marketing or transportation. The profit from handling the crop went largely to northern merchants and middle men. Southern capital was tied up in land and slaves and therefore not available for investment in other things. Under slavery, southern blacks remained a non-consuming class, and much of the intelligence, talent, and abilities of the slave population was wasted.

Antebellum Plantation Life. The "typical" antebellum plantation was more like a small village than a northern farm. Planters bought luxuries and manufactured goods, but plantations produced most household needs and nearly all the food consumed. The master exercised paternal authority over the plantation. His wife had immense domestic responsibilities. She ran the household, supervised slaves, nursed the sick, planned meals, and saw to the education of her children as well as the training of young slaves. At the same time, she played the role of a refined, gracious southern lady. Most slaves worked in the fields, but others were employed as household servants and artisans on the plantation. Though simple and crude, slave quarters compared favorably with houses of European peasants.

The Sociology of Slavery. It is difficult to generalize about slavery because so much depended on the individual master's behavior. Most owners provided adequate food, clothing, and shelter for their slaves, who were valuable property. Still, slaves had a higher rate of infant mortality and a lower life expectancy than whites. On the other hand, the United States was the only slave society in the western hemisphere whose slave population grew by natural increase. Whatever their material condition, slaves had no rights. For their
part, slaves accommodated themselves to the system while attempting to resist oppression. The "peculiar institution" hardened as northern opposition to slavery grew and southerners worried about insurrection. Slavery remained an essentially rural institution, and its existence contributed to the rural nature of the South. Not all blacks in the South were slaves; however, white southerners took a dim view of free blacks and restricted their freedom.

The Psychological Effects of Slavery. With few exceptions, such as Denmark Vesey, most slaves appeared resigned to their fate. The system fostered submissiveness and discouraged independent judgment and self-reliance on the part of blacks. In spite of this, slaves maintained strong family and group attachments as well as a culture of their own. Slavery had a detrimental impact on poor southerners, who associated working for others with servility. Slavery inevitably affected the master class as well. The patriarchal nature of the slave system reinforced male dominance in southern society. Some slave owners behaved nobly, within the confines of the institution. For others, slaves provided objects on which to vent brutal tendencies.

Manufacturing in the South. Although the temper of southern society discouraged business and commercial activities, considerable manufacturing developed. Small flour and lumber mills as well as iron and coal mining flourished. The availability of raw materials and water power led to the development of textile manufacturing; however, the southern textile industry remained insignificant compared with that of the North. Less than 15 percent of all goods manufactured in the United States in 1860 came from the South, and the region depended on the North for most of its manufactured goods.

The Northern Industrial Juggernaut. Northern society placed a premium on resourcefulness and encouraged experimentation, and industry in that region grew rapidly in the decades before the Civil War. The factory system made great strides, and a shortage of skilled labor led businessmen to substitute machines for trained hands. Westward expansion made new resources available, and the expansion of agriculture produced an increasing supply of raw materials for the mills and factories. A relaxation of earlier prejudices against the corporation made possible larger accumulations of capital. Industrial growth increased the demand for labor. Skilled artisans earned good wages; but machinery made skills less important, and the wages for an unskilled worker could barely support a family.

A Nation of Immigrants. Jobs created by industrial expansion attracted thousands of European immigrants. Native-born Americans tended to look down on immigrants, many of whom developed prejudices of their own. For example, the Irish often disliked African Americans, with whom they competed for work. The arrival of unskilled immigrants created economic disruptions.

How Wage Earners Lived. The growth of urban populations produced slums. Wives and children of male factory workers had to work in the factories to survive. Conditions for skilled workers improved in the 1840s and 1850s; the working day grew shorter, most states enacted mechanic's lien laws, and a Massachusetts court established the legality of labor unions in Commonwealth v. Hunt (1842). Unionism remained local and weak, however, at
least in part because skilled workers looked down on unskilled workers, and few laborers considered themselves part of a permanent working class.

**Progress and Poverty.** Although the United States was a democratic land of opportunity with an expanding economy, few class distinctions, and a comparatively high standard of living, there existed a large class of poor, unskilled, mostly immigrant laborers who were materially less well off than most southern slaves. The gap between rich and poor widened, and society became more stratified.

**Foreign Commerce.** The United States remained primarily an exporter of raw materials and an importer of manufactured goods. In most years, the country imported more than it exported. Cotton was the most valuable export and textiles the leading import. Britain was the leading consumer of American exports and America's leading supplier. The success of sailing packets concentrated trade in larger port cities; smaller ports languished. Several smaller port cities in New England maintained prosperity by concentrating on whaling, which boomed between 1830 and 1860. Increased foreign trade spurred the construction of ships and the development of large, fast clipper ships.

**Steam Conquers the Atlantic.** By the late 1840s, steamships captured most of the transatlantic passenger traffic, mail contracts, and first class freight; although the fast sailing ships held their own on very long voyages for many years. Britain's mastery of iron technology negated the traditional advantages American shipbuilders had enjoyed and gave Britain the lead in the development of iron ships, which were larger, stronger, and less costly to maintain. Shipping rates declined, which encouraged immigration from Europe.

**Canals and Railroads.** Canal building continued in the 1830s and 1840s; each year saw more western produce move to market through the canals. The first American railroads were built in the 1830s. These first railroads did not compete with canals for intersectional traffic; the through connections needed to move goods economically over great distances materialized slowly. Competition among railroad companies prevented connections, and engineering problems impeded growth. By the 1850s, however, these problems had been solved, and by the end of the decade, the Pennsylvania Railroad crossed the mountains.

**Financing the Railroads.** Railroad construction required immense amounts of labor and capital. Immigrants (and, in the South, slaves) did most of the work. Private investors provided most of the money invested in railroads before 1860. Towns, counties, and states also lent money to railroads, invested in railroad stock, and granted special privileges to railroads (including tax exemptions and the right to condemn property). Eastern and southern interests often opposed federal aid to railroads until after the Civil War.

**Railroads and the Economy.** Railroad construction had profound effects. The location of a railroad helped determine what agricultural land was used and how profitably it could be farmed. Land grant railroads stimulated agricultural expansion by selling farm sites at low rates on liberal terms. Access to world markets provided an incentive to agricultural production. Labor remained scarce, but new machines, including the steel plowshare and the
McCormick reaper, helped ease the labor shortage. Eastern seaports benefited from the railroads, as did intermediate centers, such as Buffalo, Cincinnati, and Chicago. Railroads also stimulated other economic activity. They spurred regional concentration of industry and investment banking. The complexity of their operations required elaborate administrative structures, which made them the first modern business enterprises. Proliferation of trunk lines and competition from the canal system led to a sharp decline in freight and passenger rates.

_Railroads and the Sectional Conflict._ The economic integration of East and West stimulated nationalism and became a force for preserving the Union. Increased production and cheap transportation meant more income and an improved standard of living for western farmers. Without railroads and canals and the link they provided to eastern markets, the Midwest would not likely have sided against the South in 1861. Failure to build a railroad system of its own cost the South its influence in the Old Northwest.

_The Economy on the Eve of the Civil War._ Between the mid-1840s and mid-1850s, the United States experienced remarkable growth in manufacturing, agricultural production, population, railroad mileage, gold production, and sales of public land. Such growth inevitably caused dislocations; and a serious economic collapse in 1857 checked agricultural expansion, which hurt the railroads and cut down on demand for manufactured goods. As a result, unemployment increased. The vigor of the economy soon ended the economic downturn. The economic panic had its greatest impact on the upper Mississippi Valley; it had little effect on the South, because cotton prices remained high.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The changes in southern agriculture.
2. Why slave ownership became more concentrated.
3. The impact of slavery on the southern economy.
4. The social and psychological impacts of slavery on southern society.
5. The factors that led to the expansion of industry.
6. The reasons for the increase of immigration and the ethnic and racial hostilities associated with it.
7. Various problems associated with the growth of large cities.
8. The impact of industrialization on workers.
9. Why a strong union movement failed to develop among American workers.

10. The role railroads played in the developing economy.

11. The impact of railroads and economic development on the sectional conflict.

POINT FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. The text suggests that slavery was not suited to an urban environment. However, the Tredegar Iron Works in Richmond was run with slave labor. What problems would an urban environment pose for the maintenance of slavery? Would such problems be insurmountable? If so, why? If not, why not?

2. In the section "How Wage Earners Lived," the text offers several explanations for the failure of unionization. Which explanation or combination of explanations seems most persuasive? Why?

3. What consequences might have resulted from the patterns of German and Irish settlement in the United States (see the “Mapping the Past” section)?

4. In spite of the inequality and exploitation inherent in the relationship between slaves and masters, is it conceivable that at least some would not develop human feelings for each other (see the “Debating the Past” section)? What other relationships characterized by inequality lead to personal relationships? In what ways are those relationships similar to slavery? In what ways are they different?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

Historians have struggled to understand the dynamics of slave society and slave culture. One of the most creative and powerful attempts to do so is Charles Joyner's book, Down by the Riverside, published in 1984. Joyner, who holds doctorates in both history and folklore, made an intensive study of the slave community in "All Saints Parish, Georgetown District, in the South Carolina low country."

Joyner employed techniques of history, folklore, and anthropology to study the transformation of diverse African cultures and European culture into something entirely new and independent, a process he called creolization. By tracing survivals and adaptations from African cultures and European culture, Joyner demonstrated how slaves borrowed freely
from European and African traditions and adapted these borrowings to their particular conditions. The process produced a new entity, an Afro-American culture.

Joyner applied this model of creolization, drawn from linguistics, to a broad range of cultural manifestations, including work patterns, food, language, and religion. His study of slave religion carefully and persuasively explained how African practices such as conjuring, spiritualism, and religious emotionalism blended with Christian beliefs to form "a distinctive Afro-Christianity that voiced the slaves' deepest ancestral values as they responded to a new and constricting environment." The originality of this religion resided "neither in its specifically African features nor in its specifically Christian features, but in its unique and creative synthesis in response to the reality of slavery."

In many ways, slaves "did not so much adapt to Christianity (at least not to the selective Christianity evangelized to them by their masters) as adapt Christianity to themselves." The masters attempted, with considerable success, to indoctrinate the slaves with the tenets of Protestant Christianity, particularly those which taught slaves to be content with their earthly lot. On the other hand, African religious beliefs and practices continued to flourish. African traditions, such as ecstatic trances and spirit possession as a part of religious ceremonies, merged with Christianity. Belief in hags and witches existed alongside Christian faith, neither part of it nor entirely outside of it. Conjuration and sorcery offered an underground alternative religious system. Those continuities with African religious practice incorporated into Christianity reflected not so much static holdovers as a creative response to the need to adapt both to Christianity and to slavery.

Belief in magical shamanism—called voodoo or hoodoo—maintained an underground existence outside of, and hostile to, Christian tradition. Joyner carefully documented the continuing presence of conjurers and medicine men among the slaves of All Saints Parish.

Slaves who adopted Christianity tended either to reject conjurism or to consider it evil. African beliefs in hags and haunts, however, proved to be more compatible with Christianity. Other slaves abandoned all belief in non-Christian mysticism.

African concepts of polytheism, rebirth, and spirit possession folded into Christianity to create a distinctly Afro-Christian religion.

In order fully to understand the religious life of slaves, Joyner closely examined the Christianity taught to the slaves by their masters. While slaveholders in early South Carolina only reluctantly tolerated attempts to Christianize their slaves, by the antebellum period, planters, at least in All Saints Parish, eagerly supported such efforts. Most planters of the area were Episcopalians, and their rector made the rounds of plantations to preach to slaves. He managed to visit each plantation once or twice a month. Many planters undoubtedly supported such efforts out of genuine concern for their slaves' spiritual welfare. However, the Christianity taught to the slaves was a highly selective version. It stressed obedience in this world as much as salvation in the next. In short, religion served as a means of social control. However sincere the minister may have been, and it would be unfair to doubt the minister's commitment to the salvation of slaves under his spiritual care, he did not preach to slaves about the Exodus from Egypt.

Joyner's point was that slaves did not passively accept the God presented to them by the local white minister. They interpreted his teachings in terms familiar to them, in terms of African understanding. Nowhere was the amalgam of Christian and African traditions more apparent than in expressive behavior in worship. The use of dances and chants, culminating
in trances and spirit possession, reflected strong African influences. The "shout" was a series of body motions performed in accompaniment to spirituals. In effect, the "shout" represented an adaptation of a West African ring dance. In South Carolina, hand clapping and foot stamping replaced the drum rhythms of Africa. The emphasis on experiencing spirit possession for conversion marked the persistence of another prominent feature of African religion.

Even if the white minister preached to slaves almost exclusively out of the New Testament, spirituals drew heavily on the Old Testament—Daniel in the lion's den, David felling Goliath, and Moses leading the children of Israel from bondage.

In summary, Afro-Christianity constituted part of the emergence of a truly creole culture in All Saints Parish. Slaves combined European and African traditions and created something new and different, something with a life of its own.

Slavery was more than an economic system; it was an arrangement of the races—an arrangement based on violence. At the same time, it was a legal institution. Law inevitably reflects the interests of a society's ruling elite, and in the antebellum South, that meant the planter class. Every southern state passed laws regulating the institution of slavery. These laws not only established the rights of masters over their property, but provided protection of that property from strangers and even protected slaves from excessively abusive masters. Slaves could not raise a hand against a white, even in self-defense. Slaves could not testify against whites in court. The law did not recognize slave marriages. A cursory examination of cases concerning the criminal law of slavery reveals the conflicting interests at work and the operation of legal institutions. It also starkly portrays the violence and cruelty at the very center of the institution.

In an act of 1741, North Carolina's legislature provided that if a person killed a slave, other than in the suppression of an insurrection, the master could bring an action to recover damages. An act of 1774 mandated a jail term for those who "wilfully and maliciously" killed a slave and failed to compensate the owner.

The first document is an act passed by North Carolina's legislature in 1791. The second document is an excerpt from the first case to be decided under that statute in the Supreme Court of North Carolina. Boon was indicted and convicted for killing a slave belonging to another. He was found guilty, and the trial court sentenced him to death. He appealed to the Supreme Court of North Carolina.

Questions for Discussion

1. All four justices of North Carolina's supreme court ruled that the Act of 1791 was too vague to allow punishment under it. On careful reading, does the act seem that vague? Is the decision surprising?

2. What conflicting property interests might have influenced the justices' decision? If the state took Boon's life, how would the owner of the slave recover damages?

3. Hall argues that the common law recognizes no crime such as killing a slave, because the common law does not recognize slavery. Do the other justices agree?

4. On what ground is Boon's conviction overturned?
3. And whereas by another act of Assembly passed in the year 1774, the killing a slave, however wanton, cruel and deliberate, is only punishable in the first instance by imprisonment and paying the value thereof to the owner; which distinction of criminality between the murder of a white person and of one who is equally an human creature, but merely of a different complexion, is disgraceful to humanity and degrading in the highest degree to the laws and principles of a free, christian and enlightened country: Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, That if any person shall hereafter be guilty of wilfully and maliciously killing a slave, such offender shall upon the first conviction thereof be adjudged guilty of murder, and shall suffer the same punishment as if he had killed a free man; (a) any law, usage or custom to the contrary notwithstanding. Provided always, That this act shall not extend to any person killing a slave outlawed by virtue of any act of Assembly of this state, or to any slave in the act of resistance to his lawful owner or master, or to any slave dying under moderate correction.
State v. Boon (1801)

HALL, J. The prisoner has been found guilty of the offence charged in the indictment [Boon was indicted and convicted under the third section of the Act of 1791 for killing a slave belonging to another]; whether any, or what punishment, can be inflicted upon him in consequence thereof, is not to be decided....

We must consider the words of the enacting clause, without regard to the preamble....If any person hereafter shall be guilty of killing a slave &c. such offender shall be adjudged guilty of murder &c. and shall suffer the same punishment, as if he had killed a free man. In case the person had killed a free man what punishment would the law have inflicted upon him? Before this question can be solved another must be asked; because upon that, the solution of the first depends. What sort of a killing was it? or what circumstances of aggravation or mitigation attended it?...That to which the Legislature referred us for the purpose of ascertaining the punishment, proper to be inflicted is, in itself, so doubtful and uncertain that I think no punishment whatever can be inflicted; without using a discretion and indulging a latitude, which in criminal cases, ought never to be allowed a Judge.

...Much latitude of construction ought not to be permitted to operate against life; if it operate at all, it should be in favor of it. Punishments ought to be plainly defined and easy to be understood; they ought not to depend upon construction or arbitrary discretion....

But it has been also contended, on behalf of the state, that the offense with which the prisoner is charged, is a felony at common law, and that having been found guilty by the jury, he ought to be punished, independently of any Act of Assembly on the subject....

Slaves in this country possess no such rights; their condition is...abject;...they are not parties to our constitution; it was not made for them.

...it is doubtful whether the offense with which he is charged is a felony at common law or not. It is doubtful whether he ought to be punished or not, that, certainly, is a sufficient reason for discharging him...I cannot hesitate to say, that he ought to be discharged.

JOHNSTON, J. The murder of a slave, appears to me, a crime of the most atrocious and barbarous nature; much more so than killing a person who is free, and on an equal footing. It is an evidence of a most depraved and cruel disposition, to murder one, so much in your power, that he is incapable of making resistance, even in his own defence...and had there been nothing in our acts of Assembly, I should not hesitate on this occasion to have pronounced sentence of death on the prisoner.

...From the context, and taking every part of the section [of the Act of 1791] under consideration, there remains no doubt in my mind respecting the intention of the Legislature; but the judges in this country...have laid down, and invariably adhered to, very strict rules in the construction of penal statutes in favor of life...

...judgment in this case should be arrested.

TAYLOR, J. ...But when the court is called upon, under an act of Assembly, to pronounce the highest punishment known to the law, they must be satisfied that the language used is clear and explicit to the object intended...I think no judgment can be pronounced.
CHAPTER 14

The Coming of the Civil War

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The Slave Power Comes North. The new fugitive slave law encouraged southerners to try to recover escaped slaves, which caused panic among black communities in northern cities. Many blacks, not all of them former slaves, fled to Canada. Many northerners refused to cooperate with the law, and abolitionists often interfered with its enforcement. In some northern states, the law became difficult to enforce. Southerners accused the North of reneging on the Compromise of 1850.

"Uncle Tom's Cabin." Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel, Uncle Tom's Cabin (1852), became an immediate best-seller, added to sectional tensions, and brought home the evils of slavery to many northerners. Southerners accused it of distorting plantation life.

Diversions Abroad: The "Young America" Movement. Spurred by a belief in manifest destiny, a search for new markets, a desire to spread democracy to the rest of the world, and a need for a distraction from sectional tensions, America embarked on an aggressive foreign policy known as the Young America movement. This expansionist sentiment encouraged William Walker to attempt to gain control of Nicaragua and George Bickley to attempt the conquest of Mexico. In 1850, Secretary of State John Clayton and the British minister to the United States, Henry Lytton Bulwer, negotiated a treaty providing for the demilitarization and joint Anglo-American control of any canal across the Central American isthmus. America had long been interested in Cuba, and that interest increased because of its strategic importance. American ministers in Europe produced the Ostend Manifesto in 1854, which proposed that America should buy Cuba or take it by force if Spain refused to sell. News of the manifesto outraged northerners, who saw it as a "slaveholders' plot," and the government was forced to disavow the manifesto along with any plans for acquiring Cuba. Commodore Perry's expedition to open Japan (1852) was another manifestation of the expansionist mood.

The Little Giant. The most prominent spokesman for the Young America movement was Stephen A. Douglas. Douglas based his politics on expansion and popular sovereignty. Although he opposed the expansion of slavery to the territories, he refused to acknowledge that any moral issue was involved. He believed that natural conditions would prevent slavery from expanding westward. Douglas wanted the Democratic nomination for president in 1852, but the party chose Franklin Pierce, who easily defeated General Winfield Scott, the Whig's nominee. Indeed, the Whig party was rapidly disintegrating. "Cotton Whigs" of the South, alienated by the antislavery opinions of northern Whigs, flocked to the Democrats. Southern Democrats controlled Congress, which disturbed both Democrats and Whigs in the North.
The Kansas-Nebraska Act. Douglas wanted the Nebraska Territory organized to open the region for a transcontinental railroad. Southerners opposed Douglas's plans. They wanted a southern route; moreover, Nebraska lay north of the Missouri Compromise line and would presumably become a free state. In an effort to gain southern support, Douglas agreed to divide the Nebraska Territory into Kansas and Nebraska and to repeal the Missouri Compromise's prohibition of slavery north of 36 degrees, 30 minutes. Popular sovereignty would decide the status of slavery in the territories. In spite of strong opposition in the North, Douglas mustered enough support to pass the bill. The Kansas-Nebraska Act was the single greatest step toward secession and civil war.

Know-Nothings, Republicans, and the Demise of the Two-Party System. Two new parties emerged from the demise of the Whigs: the American, or "Know-Nothing," party and the Republican party. The Know-Nothings espoused a nativist platform. Nativist issues cut across sectional lines, and the American party had support in all sections. Although most Know-Nothings disliked blacks, the party tended to adopt the view of slavery predominant in whichever section they were located. Former Free Soilers, "Conscience" Whigs, and "Anti-Nebraska" Democrats banded together in the Republican party. Support for the Republicans came almost exclusively from the North. Republicans were not abolitionists; rather, they wanted to keep slavery out of the territories, primarily to maintain exclusive access to the West for free white labor.

"Bleeding Kansas." The status of slavery in Kansas became a national issue, as abolitionists and defenders of slavery attempted to control the territory. Proslavery "border ruffians" from Missouri crossed into Kansas and helped to elect a proslavery territorial legislature in 1855. Antislavery settlers elected a legislature of their own. President Pierce's denunciation of the free-state government at Topeka encouraged the proslavery forces to take the offensive. They sacked the antislavery town of Lawrence; in retaliation, John Brown, an antislavery extremist, and his followers murdered five proslavery men at Pottawatomie Creek.

Senator Sumner Becomes a Martyr for Abolitionism. Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts attacked the Kansas-Nebraska Act and demanded that Kansas be admitted as a free state. He savagely berated Douglas and Senator Andrew Butler of South Carolina. Butler's nephew, Congressman Preston Brooks, took it on himself to defend his uncle's honor by beating Sumner with a cane on the floor of the Senate. Brooks became a southern hero; northerners regarded the incident as evidence of the brutalizing effect of slavery and considered Sumner a martyr.

Buchanan Tries His Hand. The Republicans nominated John C. Frémont as their candidate in 1856. The Democrats chose James Buchanan. The American party nominated ex-president Fillmore. Democrats won by denouncing the Republicans as a sectional party that threatened to destroy the Union. While Republicans believed that Buchanan lacked the character to stand up to southern extremists, many hoped that he could promote reconciliation.
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The Dred Scott Decision. Dred Scott was a slave who accompanied his owner from Missouri to Illinois and the Wisconsin Territory before returning to Missouri. In 1846, Scott brought suit in Missouri for his freedom, claiming that his residence in Illinois and Wisconsin, where slavery was prohibited, made him free. In 1857, the Supreme Court ruled that blacks were not citizens and therefore could not sue in federal court. Not satisfied with that ruling, the Court went further and declared the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional because it denied individuals the right to enjoy their property without due process of law. The Dred Scott decision threatened Douglas's principle of popular sovereignty; if Congress could not exclude slaves from a territory, surely a mere territorial legislature could not. The decision convinced many in the North that the South was engaged in an aggressive attempt to extend slavery.

The Lecompton Constitution. Buchanan appointed Robert J. Walker as territorial governor of Kansas. Although a southerner, Walker opposed the introduction of slavery into the territory against the will of its inhabitants. Proslavery leaders in Kansas convened a constitutional convention in Lecompton, in which the Free Soilers refused to participate. The rump convention drafted a proslavery constitution and refused to submit it to a vote of all settlers. Walker denounced the constitution, but Buchanan recommended that Congress admit Kansas to the Union with the Lecompton Constitution as its frame of government. This decision brought Buchanan into conflict with Douglas and split the Democratic party. In a referendum held in 1858, voters in Kansas overwhelmingly rejected the Lecompton Constitution.

The Emergence of Lincoln. Many northerners regarded Douglas as the best hope of preserving the Union, so his bid for reelection to the Senate attracted considerable attention. His Republican opponent was Abraham Lincoln, a lawyer who had previously served in the Illinois legislature and in Congress. Lincoln's personality was complex. Possessed of a wonderful sense of humor, he was subject to fits of melancholy. While not an abolitionist, Lincoln opposed the expansion of slavery into the territories. The revival of the slavery controversy in 1854 led Lincoln to a more explicit moral opposition to slavery. Still, he attacked the institution rather than the slave owners. His position won support from many who attempted to reconcile their opposition to slavery with a desire to preserve the Union.

The Lincoln-Douglas Debates. Public attention focused on a series of seven debates between Lincoln and Douglas. In reality, the two men differed little on the subject of slavery. Neither wanted slavery extended into the territories; neither believed that it would flourish in the West; and neither favored forced abolition. In the debates, however, they tended to exaggerate their differences. Douglas characterized Lincoln as an abolitionist, and Lincoln portrayed Douglas as proslavery and as a defender of the Dred Scott decision. In the Freeport debate, Lincoln pressed Douglas into admitting that the Dred Scott decision could not prohibit settlers from excluding slavery from a territory, because settlers could refuse to enact the local laws necessary to protect slavery. The so-called Freeport Doctrine helped Douglas win reelection, but it cost him dearly in the presidential campaign of 1860.

John Brown's Raid. In October 1859, John Brown and a small group of followers attacked the federal arsenal at Harpers Ferry, Virginia. They hoped to incite slaves to rebel and to use
the weapons to arm the slaves. No slaves joined them, and Brown was captured, convicted of treason, and hanged. Northerners regarded him as a martyr, while white southerners viewed him as a typical radical abolitionist.

**The Election of 1860.** By 1860, southern paranoia resulted in aggressive policies designed to defend slavery and in talk of secession. At the Democratic convention in Charleston, southern delegates refused to support Douglas, who represented the best hope for preventing a rupture between North and South, and the convention adjourned without selecting a candidate. A second convention failed to produce agreement, and the two wings met separately. Northern Democrats nominated Douglas, and southern Democrats chose John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky. The Republicans drafted a platform attractive to all classes and all sections of the northern and western states. They advocated a high tariff, a homestead law, internal improvements, and the exclusion of slavery in the territories. The Republicans chose Lincoln as their candidate because of his moderate views, his political personality, and his residence in a crucial state. The Constitutional Unionist party, composed of the remnants of the Whig and American parties, nominated John Bell of Tennessee. Lincoln received a plurality, although nowhere near a majority, of the popular vote; however, he won a decisive victory in the electoral college.

**The Secession Crisis.** In late 1860 and early 1861, South Carolina and six states of the Lower South seceded from the Union and established a provisional government for the Confederate States of America. Other southern states announced that they would secede if the North used force against the Confederacy. The South seceded because it feared northern economic and political domination. Some believed that independence would produce a more balanced economy in the South. Years of sectional conflict and growing northern criticism of slavery had undermined patriotic feelings of southerners. States' rights and a strict constructionist interpretation of the Constitution provided the South with justification for its action. Like many northerners, President-elect Lincoln believed that secession was only a bluff designed to win concessions from the North, and southerners believed that the North would not resist secession with force. President Buchanan recognized the seriousness of the situation but claimed to be without legal power to prevent secession. Moderates proposed the Crittenden Compromise, an amendment that would have recognized slavery south of 36 degrees, 30 minutes, but Lincoln opposed any extension of slavery into the territories. With the failure of the Crittenden Compromise, the Confederacy made preparations for independence, while Buchanan bumbled helplessly in Washington.
**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The ways in which the fugitive slave law contributed to sectional friction.

2. The "Young America" spirit and its implications for foreign policy.

3. The reasons for American interest in the Caribbean.

4. The political impact of the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

5. The difference between Republicans and abolitionists.

6. The failure of popular sovereignty in Kansas.

7. The impact of the Dred Scott decision.

8. The controversy over the Lecompton Constitution.

9. The factors that led to the emergence of Lincoln as a Republican leader.

10. The significance of John Brown's raid.

11. Events leading to southern secession.

**POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION**

1. Stephen Douglas devised the legislative strategy that led to the passage of the Compromise of 1850. Why, only four years later, was he willing to undo what he had helped to create?

2. Why did the election of Abraham Lincoln, who had promised not to disturb slavery in states where it existed, lead the southern states to secede?

3. The "Mapping the Past" section details the hard realities facing runaway slaves. What conditions made it more likely for a slave to escape? What might account for the persistence of the myth of the underground railroad?

4. What factors made the Civil War seem “irrepressible”? Consider information from the account in the text and the “Debating the Past” section. Was the war “irrepressible”?
LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

Abraham Lincoln remains one of the most familiar, and yet one of the most mysterious, figures in American history. Few individuals have been the subject of so much attention from historians; few remain so remote and only vaguely comprehended.

Physically, he presented a strange and striking appearance. Tall and slender, he often wore a high silk hat, which exaggerated his height. That height was mostly in his legs; when seated, he was not much taller than those with whom he sat. He had dark hair, gray eyes, and a prominent nose. His head, resting on his long, thin neck, seemed too small for the rest of him. He was almost incredibly strong, and although he moved slowly, he was quite agile. Although neat and clean, he never dressed fashionably. Indeed, he displayed a certain sartorial carelessness.

Everyone thought him homely. Some, on first impression, considered him ugly or even grotesque. Yet an English observer noted "an air of strength, physical as well as moral, and a strange look of dignity." Moreover, when he spoke, a kind of miracle occurred. He had an elastic and highly animated face that came to life when he spoke. No photograph captured this Lincoln. Nineteenth-century photography took seconds to develop an image, but perhaps not even a snapshot could have captured the expressive and powerful demeanor that contemporaries observed.

Lincoln was a magnificent writer. He wrote more words than Shakespeare, and he loved to play with words. Most of all, he could use words to convey ideas with precision or to stir the spirit of his listeners. This gifted writer had little formal education; he was not even widely read. He read Shakespeare and the Bible over and over. Yet, among American political leaders, only Jefferson rivaled him for eloquence.

Lincoln's best phrases were not impromptu; they resulted from meticulous crafting and rewriting. His ideas evolved and developed, as did his expression of them. Some can be traced from his earliest speeches into his great masterpieces, the Gettysburg Address and his Second Inaugural Address.

His capacity for keeping things to himself rivaled his ability to communicate with words. He was a master at parrying difficult questions; he often used his vast collection of anecdotes for that purpose. Friends were fascinated by his enigmatic silences. William Herndon, who shared a law office with Lincoln for six years and probably knew him as well as anyone, described him as "the most shut mouthed man who ever lived." Lincoln himself acknowledged the trait: "I am rather inclined to silence, and whether that be wise or not, it is at least more unusual now-a-days to find a man who can hold his tongue than to find one who cannot."
Lincoln was subject to fits of deep depression. He called it "hypochondria" or "the hypo." At times he literally shut himself away from the rest of the world. He was fascinated by madness and troubled by it. He wrote the following verse in 1846.

But here's an object more of dread
Than ought the grave contains
A human form with reason fled
While wretched life remains

With respect to religion, Lincoln could not be described as an orthodox Christian. He was not a churchgoer or a member of any organized sect. His religion most closely resembled Thomas Paine's deism. Early in his career, he probably was a skeptic; he certainly scoffed at politicians who called on God to support their causes. After he became president, however, he referred more frequently to the will of God in human affairs. Two personal crises, the death of his youngest son in 1850 and the death of William (his favorite son) in 1862, seem to have driven him toward religion. So, too, did the never-ending trial that began with his election. His conversion, if it was that, was typical. Rather than a blinding flash, it reflected a gradual process of redefinition and rethinking.

Whatever his personal commitment, Lincoln never belonged to any church. He explained that he had difficulty giving assent to long, complicated confessions of faith. He said that he would join any church that demanded simply: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and love thy neighbor as thyself." To the extent that he condoned any organized church, he seemed to have an affinity for the beliefs of Quakers.

During the war, he took solace in the idea that he was an "instrument of Providence" and that God had willed the war. "Surely," Lincoln wrote, "He intends some great good to follow this mighty convulsion which no mortal could make, and no mortal could stop." On another occasion he observed: "The will of God prevails.... God wills this contest, and wills that it shall not end yet. By his mere quiet power, on the minds of the now contestants, he could have either saved or destroyed this Union without a human contest. Yet the contest began. And having begun, he could give the final victory to either side any day. Yet the contest proceeds." The enormity of the Civil War, with its staggering toll of death and suffering, seems to have been more than Lincoln could bear alone. He found comfort in sharing responsibility with a being or a power greater than himself.

Aside from his gift with words, Lincoln's greatest talent was his capacity for growth. He taught himself the law (as opposed to reading law with an established attorney). Although completely untutored in the art of military science, he quickly grasped the essentials of strategy and tactics. Indeed, he understood the requirements of modern war better than most of his generals. With virtually no formal education, he made himself one of the greatest political writers in the English language. Of his many talents and gifts, this ability to grow, to improve himself, served Lincoln, and his country, best.

Much of the information in this lecture supplement can be found in Richard N. Current, The Lincoln Nobody Knows (New York: Hill and Wang, 1958). For further
One of the most controversial events of a decade full of political controversy was the Supreme Court's decision in *Dred Scott v. Sanford*. Historians have long debated why Chief Justice Taney, a staunch Jacksonian, would abandon his hesitancy to impose judicial solutions on political problems. Taney's appointment in 1836 roughly coincided with the emergence of slavery as a national issue. At that time, the law, as it related to the status of slaves and free blacks, consisted of the Constitution, a few isolated Supreme Court cases, and a few, similarly isolated, acts of Congress and the executive branch. The Constitution clearly recognized slavery; the famous three-fifths compromise and the provision prohibiting the outlawing of the African slave trade until 1808 both implicitly recognized the institution of slavery. Moreover, the Constitution specifically provided that persons who owed service or labor in one state and escaped should, upon recapture, be returned to the person to whom such service was due.

The first document is an excerpt from the Supreme Court's decision in *Prigg v. Pennsylvania* (1842). A fugitive slave from Maryland, Margaret Morgan, was discovered in Pennsylvania by her master's agent, Edward Prigg. In accordance with local law, Prigg took Morgan and her child, who had been born during Morgan's absence from Maryland, before a local magistrate in order to obtain a certificate for their removal to Maryland. The magistrate refused to issue a certificate, upon which Prigg captured the fugitive and her child and returned with them to Maryland. Prigg was then indicted and convicted for violating Pennsylvania's personal liberty law. When Pennsylvania's supreme court upheld his conviction, Prigg appealed to the United States Supreme Court on the ground that the law he had violated was in conflict with the federal Constitution.

A federal law passed in 1793 (the Fugitive Slave Act) ordered that an apprehended fugitive slave be taken to a state magistrate or judge. Upon the presentation of proof of ownership, the magistrate was to issue a certificate for the removal of the fugitive. Some northern states objected to the summary process provided in the Fugitive Slave Act and in response passed personal liberty laws (which provided for habeas corpus, jury trials, and other procedural safeguards for blacks). The issue presented by *Prigg* was: did Congress have the sole power to regulate the return of slaves? The decision of the Supreme Court, written by Justice Story, ruled that it did.

The second document is an excerpt from Justice Taney's decision in *Dred Scott v. Sanford*. After *Prigg*, several cases concerning slavery reached the Supreme Court. The most notable was *Strader v. Graham* (1850), which, in many ways, constituted a dry run for the *Dred Scott* case. *Strader v. Graham* involved two slaves who had been transported to free territory briefly and returned to a slave state. The United States Supreme Court held that it did not have jurisdiction. When the slaves returned to Kentucky, their condition was governed by the laws of Kentucky; and the appropriate expounder of Kentucky's law was that state's supreme court. By ducking the constitutional issue, the Court avoided the political firestorm occasioned by *Scott v. Sanford*.

Questions for Discussion

1. In his opinion, Taney stated that the "only issue" before the Court was whether blacks could be citizens. In the section quoted above, he argued that they could not. Having decided that, however, he went on to declare the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional. Since it was admittedly unnecessary to the decision, did the invalidation of the Missouri Compromise have the weight of law? Why might Taney have gone on to address the issue?

2. Given the similarity of Scott v. Sanford to Strader v. Graham, why did the Court even decide to rule on the case?

3. Does Taney's opinion in the Dred Scott case logically follow Story's in Prigg?
...Historically, it is well known that the object of this clause [the fugitive slave clause of the Constitution] was to secure to the citizens of the slaveholding States the complete right and title of ownership in their slaves, as property, in every State in the Union into which they might escape from the State where they were held in servitude....it cannot be doubted that it constituted a fundamental article, without the adoption of which the Union could not have been formed....

...this clause of the constitution may properly be said to execute itself, and to require no aid from legislation, State or national....

...The clause is found in the national constitution, and not in that of any State. It does not point out any state functionaries, or any state action to carry its provisions into effect. The States cannot, therefore, be compelled to enforce them...On the contrary, the natural, if not the necessary conclusion is, that the national government, in the absence of all positive provisions to the contrary, is bound, through its own proper departments, legislative, judicial, or executive, as the case may require, to carry into effect all the rights and duties imposed upon it by the constitution.

The remaining question is, whether the power of legislation upon the subject is exclusive in the national government....In our opinion, it is exclusive....

To guard, however, against any possible misconstruction of our views, it is proper to state, that we are by no means to be understood in any manner whatsoever to doubt or to interfere with the police power belonging to the States....That police power extends over all subjects within the territorial limits of the State and has never been conceded to the United States....We entertain no doubt whatsoever, that the States, in virtue of the general police power, possess full jurisdiction to arrest and restrain runaway slaves, and remove them from their borders, and otherwise to secure themselves against their depredations and evil example....The rights of the owners of fugitive slaves are in no just sense interfered with, or regulated by such a course....But such regulations can never be permitted to interfere with or to obstruct the just rights of the owner to reclaim his slave, derived from the constitution of the United States....
Dred Scott v. Sanford

The Question is simply this: Can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the constitution of the United States, and as such become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities, guarantied [sic] by that instrument to the citizen? One of which rights is the privilege of suing in a court of the United States in the cases specified in the constitution.

...The only matter in issue before the court, therefore, is, whether the descendants of such slaves, when they shall be emancipated, or who are born of parents who had become free before their birth, are citizens of a State, in the sense which the word citizen is used in the constitution....

The words "people of the United States" and "citizens" are synonymous terms....They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government through their representatives....The question before us is, whether the class of persons described in the plea in abatement compose a portion of this people, and are constituent members of this sovereignty? We think they are not, under the word "citizens" in the constitution, and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings, who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and whether emancipated or not, yet remained subject to their authority, and had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the government might choose to grant them....

In discussing the question, we must not confound the rights of citizenship which a State may confer within its own limits, and the rights of citizenship as a member of the Union. It does not by any means follow, because he has all the rights and privileges of a citizen of a State, that he must be a citizen of the United States....

In the opinion of the court, the legislation and histories of the times, and the language used in the declaration of independence, show, that neither the class of persons who had been imported as slaves, nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were then acknowledged as a part of the people, nor intended to be included in the general words used in that memorable instrument....

They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations, and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit....

...there are two clauses in the constitution which point directly and specifically to the negro race as a separate class of persons, and show clearly that they were not regarded as a portion of the people or citizens of the government then formed.

...upon full and careful consideration of the subject, the court is of opinion, that, upon the facts stated..., Dred Scott was not a citizen of Missouri within the meaning of the constitution of the United States and not entitled as such to sue in its courts....
CHAPTER 15

The War to Save the Union

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Lincoln's Cabinet. Lincoln constructed a cabinet representing a wide range of political opinions. In a conciliatory but firm inaugural address, the new president explained that his administration posed no threat to southern institutions, but he warned that secession was illegal.

Fort Sumter: The First Shot. Lincoln did not reclaim federal property seized by the Confederates in the Deep South; however, he was determined to defend Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor and Fort Pickens at Pensacola, both of which remained in federal hands. Lincoln took the moderate step of resupplying the garrison at Fort Sumter. On April 12, the Confederates opened fire on the fort and forced its surrender. Lincoln issued a call for seventy-five thousand volunteers, which prompted Virginia, North Carolina, Arkansas, and Tennessee to secede. Lincoln made it clear that he opposed secession to preserve the Union, not to abolish slavery.

The Blue and the Gray. The North possessed tremendous advantages over the Confederacy in population, industry, railroads, and naval strength. Confederates discounted these advantages. Many believed that the North would not sustain a long war and that the importance of "king cotton" to the northern and international economies would give the South the upper hand. The South had the advantage of fighting a defensive war, and it benefited from quickly finding a great commander. In contrast, many northern generals performed poorly in the early stages of the war. Little distinguished the soldiers of one side from the other. Both sides faced massive difficulties in organizing, recruiting, and administering their armies.

The Whig prejudice against powerful presidents was part of Lincoln's heritage, but he proved to be a capable and forceful leader. Although anything but a tyrant, Lincoln exceeded the conventional limits of presidential authority.

The Confederacy faced greater problems, for it had to create an entire administration under the pressure of war, with the additional handicap of its commitment to states' rights. The Confederacy based its government on precedents and machinery taken over from the United States. In contrast to Lincoln, President Jefferson Davis, despite his many personal virtues, proved to be neither a good politician nor a popular leader.
The Test of Battle: Bull Run. The first battle of the Civil War took place on July 21, 1861, near the Bull Run River. Confederate forces, led by P. G. T. Beauregard, routed federal troops commanded by Irvin McDowell. The Confederates were too disorganized to follow up their victory, but panic gripped Washington. The battle had little practical impact, except to boost southern morale. After Bull Run, Lincoln devised a new strategy that included a naval blockade of southern ports, operations in the West to gain control of the Mississippi River, and an invasion of Virginia. Lincoln also appointed George B. McClellan, an experienced soldier and an able administrator, to command the Union forces.

Paying for the War. By the fall of 1861, the United States had organized a disciplined and well-supplied army in the East. Northern factories turned out the weapons and supplies necessary to fight a war. To supply the Army and to offset the drain of labor into the military, industrial units tended to increase in size and to rely more on mechanization. Congress financed the war by enacting excise and income taxes, assessing a direct tax on the states, borrowing, and printing paper money.

Politics as Usual. The secession of the South left the Republicans in control of Congress. Although most Democrats supported measures necessary to conduct the war, they objected to the Lincoln administration's conduct of it. Slavery remained a divisive issue. Radical Republicans, led by Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens, advocated the abolition of slavery and granting full civil and political rights to blacks. They became increasingly influential as the conflict progressed. Moderate Republicans objected to making abolition a war aim and opposed granting equal rights to blacks. Peace Democrats, or "Copperheads," opposed all measures in support of the war and hoped for a negotiated peace with the South. Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus and applied martial law freely during the war. Although courts attempted to protect civil liberties, they could not enforce their decrees when they came into conflict with the military. After the war, in *Ex parte Milligan* (1866), the Supreme Court declared the military trials of civilians illegal in areas where regular courts still functioned.

Behind Confederate Lines. The South also revised its strategy after Bull Run. Davis relied primarily on a defensive war to wear down the Union's will to fight. The Confederacy did not develop a two-party system, but there was plenty of political strife. Conflicts continually erupted between Davis and southern governors. The Confederacy's main problem was finance. It relied on income and excise taxes, a tax in kind, borrowing, cotton mortgages, and printing paper currency. Supplying its armies strained southern resources, and the blockade made it increasingly difficult to obtain European goods. Southern expectations that "king cotton" would force England to aid the South went unrealized. England had a large supply of cotton when the war broke out and found other suppliers in India and Egypt.
War in the West: Shiloh. After Bull Run, no important battles took place until early 1862. McClellan continued his preparation to attack Richmond, while Union forces commanded by Ulysses S. Grant invaded Tennessee. Grant captured forts Henry and Donelson and marched toward Corinth, Mississippi. A Confederate force led by Albert Sidney Johnston attacked Grant at Shiloh on April 6. Although Grant's troops held their ground and forced the Confederates to retreat the following day, the surprise attack and the heavy Union losses so shook Grant that he allowed the enemy to escape. Shiloh cost Grant his command.

The casualties at Shiloh were staggering. New technology, which made weapons more deadly, accounted for the carnage. Gradually, generals began to adjust their tactics and to experiment with field fortifications.

McClellan: The Reluctant Warrior. McClellan launched his campaign against Richmond in the spring of 1862. The Peninsula Campaign revealed McClellan's deficiencies as a military commander. He saw war as a gentlemanly contest of maneuver, guile, and position; he was reluctant to commit his troops to battle. He constantly overestimated the strength of his enemy and failed to take advantage of his superior numbers. At the indecisive Battle of Seven Pines, McClellan lost the initiative. During that battle, the Confederate commander, Joseph E. Johnston, was wounded. Robert E. Lee replaced him. Lee was courtly, tactful, and modest, yet on the battlefield he was a bold and daring gambler. Lee's brilliant and audacious tactics forced McClellan to retreat.

Lee Counterattacks: Antietam. McClellan's performance dismayed Lincoln, who reduced his authority by placing him under General Henry Halleck. Halleck called off the Peninsula Campaign. After Lee defeated General John Pope's forces at the Second Battle of Bull Run in August 1862, however, Lincoln once again turned to McClellan. Lee hoped to strike a dramatic blow by invading northern territory. His march was halted at Antietam Creek in Maryland on September 17. Although the two sides fought to a draw, Lee's army was perilously exposed. McClellan's failure to pursue Lee led Lincoln once again to dismiss him.

The Emancipation Proclamation. Antietam provided Lincoln with the opportunity to make emancipation a war aim. The Emancipation Proclamation, issued on September 22, 1862, declared all slaves in areas still in rebellion on January 1, 1863, to be free. The proclamation did not apply to border states or to parts of the Confederacy already controlled by federal troops. Practically speaking, the proclamation did not free a single slave. Yet it served Lincoln's military needs and gained the support of liberal opinion in Europe. If anything, the proclamation aggravated racial tensions in the North. Democrats attempted to make political capital out of racist sentiment in the North; Republicans often defended the Emancipation Proclamation with racist arguments of their own.

The Draft Riots. The passage of the Conscription Act in March 1863 resulted in draft riots in several northern cities. The most serious took place in New York in July. Many of the rioters were workers who opposed conscription and the idea of fighting to free slaves, in part because they believed that freed slaves would compete for their jobs. The New York riot began as a protest against conscription and became an assault on blacks and the well-to-do.
The Emancipation Proclamation neither reflected nor initiated a change in white attitudes; most white northerners continued to believe in the inferiority of blacks. Lincoln was no exception, but his views were evolving.

**The Emancipated People.** Both slaves and free blacks regarded the Emancipation Proclamation as a promise of future improvement, even if it failed immediately to liberate slaves or to ease racial tensions. Lincoln's racial views might seem unenlightened by modern standards, but even his most militant black contemporaries respected him. After January 1, 1863, slaves flocked to Union lines in droves.

**African-American Soldiers.** By 1862, the need for manpower argued for a change in the law of 1792 that barred blacks from the army. In August, the secretary of war authorized the military government of the captured South Carolina sea islands to enlist slaves. After the Emancipation Proclamation authorized the enlistment of blacks, states began to recruit black soldiers. By the end of the war, one of eight Union soldiers was black. Black soldiers fought in segregated units commanded by white officers. Even though they initially received only about half of what white soldiers were paid, black troops soon proved themselves in battle. Their casualty rate was higher than that of white units, partly because many captured black soldiers were killed on the spot.

**Antietam to Gettysburg.** McClellan's replacement, General Ambrose E. Burnside, differed from McClellan in that he was an aggressive fighter. His disastrous attack at Fredricksburg led to his replacement by Joseph Hooker, whom Lee defeated at Chancellorsville. Nevertheless, Chancellorsville cost the Confederates dearly; their losses were roughly equal to those of the Union forces, and theirs were harder to replace. In addition, Stonewall Jackson was killed in the battle. To compound matters, the war in the West was not going well for the Confederacy. Given his own situation and the decline in northern morale after Chancellorsville, Lee decided once again to invade the North. The Union army, now commanded by George Meade, halted Lee's advance at Gettysburg. Lee retreated after losing a major battle for the first time. Meade, however, failed to press his advantage.

**Lincoln Finds His General: Grant at Vicksburg.** Grant assumed command of the Union troops in the West when Halleck was called East in July 1862. While the great struggle at Gettysburg took place, Grant executed a daring series of maneuvers that led to the surrender of Vicksburg. Grant's victory gave the Union control of the Mississippi River and split the Confederacy. After Grant won another decisive victory at Chattanooga, Lincoln promoted him to lieutenant general and gave him supreme command of the armies of the United States.

**Economic and Social Effects, North and South.** By the end of 1863, the Confederacy was on the road to defeat. Northern military pressure sapped its manpower; the blockade sapped
its economic strength. Shortages led to drastic inflation. Efforts to increase manufacturing were only moderately successful because of shortages in labor, capital, and technical knowledge. Southern prejudice against centralized authority prevented the Confederacy from making effective use of its scarce resources. On the other hand, the northern economy boomed after 1861. Government demand stimulated manufacturing. Congress passed a number of economic measures previously blocked by southerners, including various tariffs, the Homestead Act (1862), the Morrill Land Grant Act (1862), and the National Banking Act (1863). Although the economy grew, it did so at a slower pace than before or after the war. Inflation eroded workers' purchasing power, which, in turn, led to strikes. Reduced immigration contributed to labor shortages. The war hastened industrialization and laid the basis for many other aspects of modern civilization.

Women in Wartime. Many southern women took over the management of farms and plantations while the men were away in military service; others served as nurses in the Confederate medical corps or as government clerks. Northern women also ran farms and took jobs in factories or with government agencies. Elizabeth Blackwell, the first woman doctor in the United States, helped to organize the Sanitary Commission. The gradual acceptance of women nurses indicated that the "proper sphere" for women was expanding—another modernizing effect of the war.

Grant in the Wilderness. Grant's strategy was to attack Lee and to try to capture Richmond while General William Tecumseh Sherman marched from Chattanooga to Atlanta. Grant attempted to outflank Lee in a series of battles in which he gained little advantage and suffered heavy losses. Grant knew, however, that his losses could be replaced; the South's could not. Grant moved around Lee's flank and struck towards Petersburg. Lee rushed in forces to hold the city, which Grant placed under siege. Lee was pinned.

Sherman in Georgia. In June, the Republicans renominated Lincoln with Andrew Johnson as his running mate. The Democratic nominee, McClellan, advocated peace at any price. Lincoln's chances looked slim. In September, however, Sherman captured Atlanta and began his march to the sea. Lincoln won reelection handily. In December 1864, Sherman, who believed in total war and in the necessity of destroying the South's economic base and its morale, entered Savannah and marched northward.

To Appomattox Court House. Lee desperately tried to pull his army back from Petersburg, but his force was enveloped by Grant's. Richmond fell on April 3. Lee and Grant met at Appomattox Court House on April 9, where Lee surrendered. Grant's terms required only that Confederate soldiers lay down their arms and return to their homes. He agreed to allow southern soldiers to keep their horses.

Winners, Losers and the Future. The Civil War cost the nation more than 600,000 lives. The South suffered enormous property damage. The war left bitterness on both sides. Despite the cost, the war ended slavery, and secession became almost inconceivable. A war designed to preserve a Union of states had created a nation. America emerged from the war with a more technologically advanced and productive economic system.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. Lincoln's rationale for the defense of the Union.

2. The material advantages enjoyed by the North as the war began and the advantages enjoyed by the South.

3. Northern strategy at the beginning of the war (the "Anaconda Plan").

4. The impact of the war on the northern economy and on northern economic development.

5. The political divisions in northern society during the war.

6. Southern strategy as the war began.

7. Political divisions within the Confederacy.

8. The failure of cotton diplomacy.


10. The causes of the draft riots.

11. The impact of the northern blockade on the Confederacy.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Discuss the respective virtues and failings of Lincoln and Davis as war leaders. How important was this match up to the outcome of the war?

2. It is often assumed that the South had better military leadership. Might it be argued that the South enjoyed superior military leadership in the East, at least until 1864, but that the North had consistently better leadership in the West?
3. Consider the impact of the draft riots on black citizens in the North. During the New York riots, blacks were beaten and lynched, many homes were destroyed, and the mob burned a black orphanage. Given this and the general racism in the North, is the willingness of blacks to fight for the North surprising? If not, why not?

4. Discuss the impact of technology on the Civil War. Why did generals on both sides fail to adapt quickly? To what extent did this contribute to the massive loss of life on both sides?

5. What was the "broader truth about black soldiers" conveyed by the movie, *Glory*? (Consult the "Re-Viewing the Past" section).

6. Historians have proposed a number of theories explaining why the South lost the Civil War (see the “Debating the Past” section). Consult the sections in Chapter 15 titled “Economic and Social Effects, North and South” and “Behind Confederate Lines” as well as the sections in Chapter 14 titled “Economics of Slavery,” Manufacturing in the South,” and “the Northern Industrial Juggernaut.” The “Debating the Past” section suggests that the South lost because of a loss of morale. What caused that loss of morale?

7. Does *Cold Mountain* (see the “Re-Viewing the Past” section) reflect sensibilities of the Civil War or of modern America? Using the figure for the total number of Union and Confederate casualties (which give the total number of troops for each side) and the figures on desertion in the “Re-Viewing the Past” section, which side had the higher rate of desertion? Do these figures support or contradict the analysis of the authors? Explain why.

**LECTURE SUPPLEMENT**

The text discusses the decision of the Union to use black troops. Far less known is the agonizing debate that took place within the Confederacy during the final months of the war over the use of slaves as soldiers. The debate reveals much about the importance of slavery as a war aim of the South. Slavery was central to the Confederacy and to its constitution, which, although modeled on the United States Constitution, far more explicitly protected the South's peculiar institution. The reluctance of southerners to consider emancipation indicated the primacy of slavery over independence as a war aim. It also revealed that many southerners knew or suspected what they would not admit, perhaps even to themselves: their slaves wanted freedom and would fight for it.
When the North began to make use of black soldiers in 1863, scattered southerners began to suggest that the South make greater military use of its population of adult, male slaves. Ironically, despite the Deep South's customary opposition to any racial change, the first calls for change came from Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The triumph of Union armies in that region clearly contributed to the willingness of some to experiment. Not surprisingly, such suggestions prompted heated rebuttals. In Virginia, still far from the threat of Grant's army in the West, the heretical ideas emerging in the Deep South received little attention.

Things changed, however, as the South's situation deteriorated. In 1864, the Confederate government passed a law authorizing the War Department to impress free blacks for noncombat military duties and, if necessary, to impress as many as twenty thousand slaves for the same purposes.

In the wake of the Battle of Chattanooga, a major general in the Confederate Army of Tennessee, Patrick R. Cleburne, proposed freeing all the slaves and arming some of them. Aside from providing manpower, Cleburne argued, the abolition of slavery might induce England and France to come to the South's aid. Jefferson Davis suppressed Cleburne's proposal.

Nevertheless, after Atlanta fell, Davis himself began to pave the way for the use of slaves as Confederate soldiers. He did so by stressing in a number of speeches that independence, not slavery, was the South's overarching war aim.

By the fall of 1864, the Richmond Enquirer proposed that the Confederate government purchase 250,000 slaves, grant them freedom, and train them as soldiers. Other papers endorsed the proposal. Support was by no means unanimous, but the debate cut to the heart of the issue of slavery. Would slaves fight for their freedom? If so, did this not undercut the underlying assumptions of slavery?

In November 1864, Davis, supported by his secretary of state, Judah P. Benjamin, put forward a plan that provided for the Confederate government to buy slaves for the army. The government would reward faithful service with emancipation. The proposal met with a firestorm of criticism. Robert E. Lee, however, privately supported the idea. In February 1865, Lee lent his enormous prestige to the idea of using slaves as soldiers, granting them freedom upon enlistment, and granting freedom at the end of the war to the families of those who served faithfully.

In March 1865, the Confederate Congress authorized the use of slaves as Confederate soldiers. The Virginia legislature passed an act authorizing the Confederate government to call on the Governor to provide up to 25 percent of male slaves between the ages of eighteen and forty-five. Not even Lee's counsel, however, could convince the legislature to embrace emancipation. Other southern states proved unwilling to go even as far as Virginia.

Faced with the fact of Grant's powerful and growing army and Lee's dwindling force, Davis and the War Department slipped emancipation into the policy simply by adding their own regulations.
A small group of black soldiers began to drill in Richmond. By this time, however, Grant was pressing forward relentlessly. Lee had to abandon Richmond, and he and his army headed for Appomattox.

The war disrupted the lives not only of those who fought but of those who stayed home. Southern women suffered great privations as well as personal grief. A number of southern women kept diaries, and these offer powerful and personal insights into life in the Confederacy during the war.

The first document is from the diary of Lucy Gilmer Breckinridge of Grove Hill. Only eighteen when the war began, this daughter of an old-line Virginia family began keeping a diary in the summer of 1862. Before the war ended, five of her brothers had joined the Confederate army. Given its location south and west of the fighting in the Valley campaign, Grove Hill was spared the devastation of battle. Still, the war was part of daily life. Women at Grove Hill sewed clothing, made bandages, cared for the sick and wounded, read, prayed, and worried about their loved ones in the military.

The second document is from the most famous of Civil War diaries, Mary Chesnut's. Mary was born in 1823 to the Boykins, a modest planter and politician, and his wife, who came from a distinguished Virginia family. Mary received her education at Madame Talvande's French School for Young Ladies in Charleston. She married James Chesnut, Jr., a graduate of Princeton, in 1840 and went to live at Mulberry, a plantation owned by the Chesnut family in South Carolina. James and Mary Chesnut presided over a huge plantation, which included sawmills, gristmills, tanyards, brickyards, and a landing on the Wateree River. James served in the South Carolina legislature and in the state senate, of which he became president in 1856. Two years later, he won election to the United States Senate, an office from which he resigned upon Lincoln's election. Although denied a seat in the Confederate Senate, he accepted a post on the executive council that governed South Carolina. In late 1862, he went to Richmond as an aide to Jefferson Davis. The Davises and Chesnuts became social intimates as well as political allies. In 1864, James was commissioned brigadier general. James survived the war, but Mulberry was pillaged and severely damaged.

Younger even than Lucy Breckinridge was Clara Solomon, who kept a diary from June 1861 to July 1862. Clara was sixteen when she began keeping her diary. Her experience differed in several respects from the other diarists. A native and resident of New Orleans, the largest urban center in the South, she experienced the occupation of her city by Union troops. In addition, she was Jewish. The Solomon family lived comfortably; they had an Irish domestic servant as well as a household slave. Clara and her entire family were staunch Confederates. Her father, a merchant, was forty-six years old at the beginning of the war. He served the Confederacy as a suttler (a supplier of clothing and equipment to the troops). Clara's entries in her diary expressed optimism in the early days of the war. That optimism dissipated as the death toll mounted, shortages of food and merchandise became increasingly burdensome, Union forces occupied her city, and she began to doubt the prospects for military victory.

Like Clara Solomon, Sarah Morgan lived in Louisiana; however, she lived in Baton Rouge, rather than New Orleans. Sarah began her diary in January 1862; she would turn twenty the next month. Her father, Thomas Gibbes Morgan, died in 1861. He had been a prominent attorney in Baton Rouge and had also served as district judge and district attorney.
During the debate over secession, Thomas Morgan favored preservation of the Union, a position apparently shared by his daughter. When war came, however, the Morgans became loyal Confederates. Like New Orleans, Baton Rouge was occupied by the Union army. Confederate shelling of the Union-held city forced the Morgans to flee. They stayed with friends on a plantation outside the city, but the course of battle chased them from that location as well. Eventually Sarah and her mother went to New Orleans, where they found refuge in the home of Sarah's Unionist half-brother. Two of Sarah's brothers died in January 1864. Both died of illness while serving the Confederate cause—one in a Union prisoner of war camp, the other while serving with his unit.

Questions for Discussion

1. Compare the much younger Lucy Breckinridge with the more mature Mary Chesnut.

2. Consider Lucy Breckinridge's private cause for grief early in the war and the more general and public cause for Mary Chesnut's sorrow late in the war. Might the difference reflect the stage of the war? The difference in age of the diarists? A difference in position (Mary Chesnut was close to many Confederate officials and generals)? It is worth noting that Mary Chesnut, too, lost friends and relatives during the war.

3. Compare Clara Solomon's romantic impression of the death of Charley Dreux with Lucy Breckinridge's more somber reflection on the death of her brother. What might account for the different reactions of the two young women?

4. Compare Sarah Morgan's attitude toward the Yankees in her entry of May 1862 with that of her entry in January 1863. What might account for the change?

5. Even in May 1862, Sarah Morgan seems to have conflicting emotions. Can you reconcile her Unionist sentiments with her intense Confederate sympathies?

6. All four diarists felt the impact of the war, yet the nature of the impact differed. Discuss the different ways in which the war affected each.

6. Do the reflections in these diaries support or contradict the conclusion in the “Debating the Past” section?
Diary of Lucy Breckinridge

Sunday, August 12th, 1862

It rained so steadily today that we could not go to church. I sat all the morning in the library with George talking about "reds" and marriages. He said very earnestly, "Well, Luce, take my advice and do not get married until the war is over. There are many reasons why you should not; for instance, you might be a widow in a short time." Then, after thinking a few minutes, it seemed to strike him that it would not be such a bad thing to be a pretty young widow. He has an idea that I am engaged, and seems to take a great deal more interest in me; treats me with marked respect and unwonted tenderness. He is a funny boy and a very sweet one. I never loved him so much before, because all my special love was given to John [Lucy's brother]. He and I were so nearly the same age, and never were separated in any way until the last two or three years. I loved him better than anyone on earth. Though we were playmates from our babyhood, I do not ever remember having been angry with John. I was more intimate with him and stayed with him more than I did with Eliza [Lucy's sister]. We never formed a plan for the future in which we were not connected. Everything seems changed to me since he died. He was the noblest and best of us all, and all his life had been the favorite with his brothers and sisters. "God takes our dearest even so; the reason why we cannot know; helpless he leaves us crushed with woe."

Eliza and Emma went over to the graveyard and put up a white cross with John's name on it and the date of the Battle of Seven Pines with the inscription, "He hath entered into peace," and put garlands of ivy on it. It is only a temporary mark for the grave. All of his brothers and sisters wish to raise a monument to his memory, the first of our band who has been taken from us. What a sad summer this has been.
Mary Chesnut's Diary

February 23, 1865

Charleston and Wilmington—surrendered. I have not further use for a newspaper. I never want to see another one as long as I live.

Wade Hampton lieutenant general—too late. If he had been lieutenant general and given the command in South Carolina six months ago, I believe he would have saved us. Achilles was sulking in his tent—at such a time!

Shame, disgrace, beggary—all at once. Hard to bear.

Grand smash —

Rain—rain outside—inside naught but drowning floods of tears.

I could not bear it, so I rushed down in that rainstorm to the Martins. He met me at the door.

"Madame, Columbia is burned to the ground."

I bowed my head and sobbed aloud.

"Stop that," he said, trying to speak cheerfully. "Come here, wife. This woman cries with her whole heart—just as she laughs." But in spite of his words, his voice broke down—he was hardly calmer than myself.
Diary of Clara Solomon

Saturday, July 6th, 1861

...Do we not admire [Stonewall] Jackson? 'Tis true, the Northerners are raging an unholy and unrighteous war against us, but do they not think that they have Justice on their side. We know they haven't....

Sunday, July 7th, 1861

We were somewhat startled at Pa's voice & when he called us, I was still more so when he called us. He said "Charles Dreux is dead; he was shot in the head in a skirmish"!!! I was horrified. He was so fine, intelligent and well-liked, [a] man. I immediately thought of his young wife and child, whom he left. How she grieved and mourned at his departure—and what horrible news would she soon be made aware of. He held a position as Colonel, which is an exalted one for so young a man...

How many heart-rending tales like this, have we yet to hear. When first he received his wound, and felt that it must be fatal, instantaneously, thoughts of his dear wife and child must have crossed his mind, and with their names last on his lips, he was ushered into eternity—How painful will be the duty of the one who will unfold to her a tale, which will blight her young life, crush her dearest hopes, and perhaps, forever cast a gloom over her future...

Tuesday, September 17th, 1861

8 1/4 P.M....We have just repaired from the dining room, where we have been indulging in bread and molasses, and wishing for one of those nice fish suppers, of which nothing but the memory of them, now remains....

Thursday, April 24th, 1862

My heart aches as I daily read the long lists of death. "Died from wounds received at the battle of Shiloh."

Sunday, May 4th, 1862

...a gloom has settled o'er my spirit, a gloom envelopes our dearly-beloved city. My breaking heart but aches the more, when I am prepared to record events, which can never fade from my memory...the Yankees had passed our forts & were on their way to our city, it having been decided to be the most daring naval exploit ever attempted, as they passed under our fires, our brave men, fighting to the last....

...Beef is 40 cts. a pound. Everything in proportion. No bread at all. There is no flour.
Thursday, May 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1862

The square is still occupied by some [Union soldiers] & there are a few remaining tents there. But the St. Charles! My heart sank within me when I beheld it. \textit{Never} in connection with the Yankees have I experienced such sensations. It looks to be a perfect wreck. They are loitering around it, lying down, playing cards, & their clothes hanging around. Oh! it was a loathsome sight, & I wondered how men could submit to it. I \textit{couldn't}. Saw stragglers on my way to Canal St. & there saw more, who are strutting along with such an air of defiance as I never saw, so scornful, so unassuming. Their looks being, "We have conquered you."...Oh! that our streets should be ever disgraced.
Diary of Sarah Morgan

May 9th. [1862]

"All devices, signs, and flags of the confederacy shall be suppressed." So says Picayune Butler [General Benjamin F. Butler, the Union commander. A picayune was a coin of little value (five cents)]. Good. I devote all my red, white, and blue silk to the manufacture of Confederate flags. As soon as one is confiscated, I make another, until my ribbon is exhausted, when I will sport a duster emblazoned in high colors, "Hurrah! for the Bonny blue flag!" Henceforth, I wear one pinned to my bosom—not a duster, but a little flag—the man who says take it off, will have to pull it off for himself; the man who dares attempt it — well! a pistol in my pocket will fill up the gap. I am capable, too.

This is a dreadful war to make even the hearts of women so bitter! I hardly know myself these last few weeks. I who have such a horror of bloodshed, consider even killing in self defense murder, who cannot wish them the slightest evil, whose only prayer is to have them sent back in peace to their own country, I talk of killing them! for what else do I wear a pistol and carving knife?

May 14th.

I have a brother-in-law in the Federal army that I love and respect as much as anyone in the world, and shall not readily agree that his being a Northerner would give him an irresistible desire to pick my pockets, and take from him all power of telling the truth. No! There are few men I admire more than Major Drum, and I honor him for his independence in doing what he believes is Right....

...I was never a secessionist, for I quietly adopted father's views on political subjects, with out meddling with them; but even father went over with his state, and when so many outrages were committed by the fanatical leaders of the North, though he regretted the Union, said "Fight to the death for our liberty." I say so too....

January 1st. Thursday. 1863.

I learn, to my unspeakable grief, that the State House [in Baton Rouge] is burned down....Adieu, Home and Happiness! Yankees inhabit my first, and have almost succeeded in destroying my second. Let the whole town burn, now; without our State House, it is nothing. Without its chief ornament, what does our poor little town look like? Do wretched Yankees, standing in the little room at home, look through the single window without seeing the white towers against the blue sky?...Though desecrated, mutilated, pillaged, almost destroyed within by the Yankees in their previous visit, still we had the outside left untouched, at last, until this crowning act of barbarism. Our beautiful gardens! Our evening walks! Oh Yankees! If you were only in glory! You'd have fire enough there, to induce you to dispense with the burning of our beautiful State House!...

...O my home! Our "city of bowers"! I wish you had been laid low before you were desecrated by the touch of Yankee heathens! Nothing but fire can purify you now. Burn, then, and may the Yankees burn with you!
CHAPTER 16

Reconstruction and the South

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Presidential Reconstruction. After John Wilkes Booth assassinated Abraham Lincoln on April 14, 1865, the national mood hardened. However, in spite of the amount of blood shed, the Civil War caused less intersectional hatred than might have been expected; animosity quickly subsided, and most Confederate leaders were only mildly punished. The status of the southern states raised complex legal questions about the process of readmitting them to the Union. The process of readmission began in 1862, when Lincoln appointed provisional governors for those areas of the South occupied by federal troops. In December 1863, he issued a proclamation that provided that southerners, with the exception of high Confederate officials, could reinstate themselves as United States citizens by taking a loyalty oath. A state could set up a government when a number equal to 10 percent of those who voted in 1860 took the oath. The Radicals disliked Lincoln's plan and passed the Wade-Davis Bill, which required a majority of voters in a state to take the loyalty oath before a constitutional convention could be convened. The bill further required that the states prohibit slavery and repudiate Confederate debts. Lincoln pocket-vetoed the bill. After Johnson became president, he issued an amnesty proclamation only slightly more rigorous than Lincoln's. By the time Congress reconvened in December 1865, all of the southern states had organized governments, ratified the Thirteenth Amendment, and elected senators and representatives. Johnson submitted the new governments to Congress.

Republican Radicals. Both radical and moderate Republicans wanted to protect ex-slaves from exploitation and to guarantee their basic rights. Radicals, however, demanded full political equality; moderates were unwilling to go so far. Their agreement on a minimum set of demands doomed Johnsonian Reconstruction. Moreover, Republicans feared that the balance of power in Congress might swing to the Democrats because the Thirteenth Amendment increased the South's congressional representation by negating the Three-Fifths Compromise. In addition, southern voters provoked northern resentment by electing former Confederate leaders to office, and Black Codes, passed by southern governments to control ex-slaves, further outraged the North.

Congress Rejects Johnsonian Reconstruction. Spurred on by southern recalcitrance, congressional Republicans rejected Johnsonian Reconstruction and created a committee on Reconstruction to study the question of readmitting southern states. Johnson further alienated Republicans in Congress by vetoing an extension of the Freedman's Bureau and the Civil Rights Act. Congress overrode the veto of the Civil Rights Act, and thereafter Congress, not the president, controlled Reconstruction.
The Fourteenth Amendment. In June 1866, Congress submitted the Fourteenth Amendment to the states. This truly radical measure granted blacks political rights and, in doing so, expanded the power of the federal government at the expense of the states. In addition, it broadened the definition of citizenship and struck at discriminatory legislation, such as the Black Codes, by guaranteeing all citizens due process and equal protection of the law. It attempted to force southern states to permit blacks to vote; those states that did not face a reduction of their congressional representation. The amendment also barred former federal officials who had served the Confederacy from holding state or federal office unless they received a pardon from Congress. Finally, it repudiated the Confederate debt. Johnson made the choice between the Fourteenth Amendment and his own policy the main issue of the 1866 elections. This strategy failed dismally; the Republicans won veto-proof majorities in both houses of Congress and control of all the northern state governments.

The Reconstruction Acts. The refusal of southern states to accept the Fourteenth Amendment led to the passage, over Johnson's veto, of the First Reconstruction Act in March 1867. This law divided the South into five military districts commanded by a military officer with extensive powers to protect the civil rights of "all persons" and to maintain order. To end military rule, states had to adopt new constitutions that both guaranteed blacks the right to vote and disenfranchised many ex-Confederates. The new state governments also had to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment. Congress passed two more Reconstruction Acts to tighten and clarify procedures. Arkansas became the first state to gain readmission in June 1868, and by July enough states had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment to make it part of the Constitution. The last southern state to qualify for readmission, Georgia, did so in July 1870.

Congress Supreme. The South's refusal to accept the spirit of even the mild Reconstruction designed by Johnson goaded the North to ever more strident measures to bring the ex-Confederates to heel. Johnson's intractability also influenced the Republicans, and they became obsessed with the need to defeat him. A series of measures passed between 1866 and 1868 increased the authority of Congress over many areas of government. Still not satisfied, the Republicans finally attempted to remove Johnson from office. Although a poor president, Johnson had really done nothing to merit ejection from office. The Republicans accused Johnson of violating the Tenure of Office Act by dismissing Secretary of War Stanton without obtaining the Senate's approval. The House promptly impeached Johnson, but the Radicals failed to secure a conviction in the Senate by a single vote.

The Fifteenth Amendment. The Republican candidate, Ulysses Grant, defeated the Democratic nominee, Horatio Seymour, for the presidency in 1868. Southern blacks enfranchised under the Reconstruction Acts provided Grant's narrow margin of victory in the popular vote. The Fourteenth Amendment and Reconstruction Acts enabled southern blacks to vote, but the Radicals wanted to guarantee blacks the right in all states, despite the unpopularity of the idea in the North. Congress passed the Fifteenth Amendment, which forbade states to deny the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The amendment became part of the Constitution in March 1870.
"Black Republican" Reconstruction: Scalawags and Carpetbaggers. During Reconstruction, former slaves had real political influence; they voted, held office, and exercised the rights guaranteed them by the Fourteenth Amendment. However, black officeholders were neither numerous nor inordinately influential. The real rulers of "black Republican" governments were "scalawags," southern whites who cooperated with the Republicans, and "carpetbaggers," northerners who went to the South for idealistic reasons or in search of opportunities. Blacks failed to dominate southern governments because they generally lacked political experience, were often poor and uneducated, and were nearly everywhere a minority. Those blacks who held office tended to be better educated and more prosperous than most southern blacks; many had been free before the war. Most black officeholders proved to be able and conscientious public servants. Others were incompetent and corrupt. In this regard, little distinguished them from their white counterparts. Corruption in northern cities dwarfed that in the South. Radical southern governments, in conjunction with the Freedman's Bureau and philanthropic organizations, did much to rebuild the South and to expand social services and educational opportunities for whites and blacks.

The Ravaged Land. The South's economic problems complicated the rebuilding of its political system. Although in the long run the abolition of slavery released immeasurable quantities of human energy, the immediate effect was chaos. Thaddeus Stevens was the leading proponent of confiscating the property of southern planters and distributing it among blacks. Establishing ex-slaves on small farms without adequate tools, seeds, and other necessities, however, would have done them little good. Yet, without a redistribution of land, former slaves were confined to the established framework of southern agriculture. Southern whites considered blacks incapable of providing for themselves as independent farmers. Southern productivity did decline, but not because blacks could not work independently. Blacks chose no longer to work like slaves; for example, they did not force their children into the fields at very early ages.

Sharecropping and the Crop-Lien System. Immediately after the Civil War, southern planters attempted to farm their lands by gang labor consisting of ex-slaves working for wages. This system did not work because it reminded blacks of slavery and because capital was scarce. Sharecropping emerged as an alternative. Sharecropping gave blacks more control over their lives and the hope of earning enough to buy a small farm. However, few managed to buy their own farms, in part because of white resistance to blacks owning land. Many white farmers in the South were also trapped by the sharecropping system. Scarcity of capital led to the development of the crop-lien system, which locked southern agriculture into the cultivation of cash crops. Compared to the rest of the country, the South's economy grew slowly after the Civil War, and its share of the national output of manufactured goods declined sharply during the Reconstruction era.

The White Backlash. To check black political power, dissident southerners formed secret terrorist societies, the most notorious of which was the Ku Klux Klan. Formed in 1866 as a social club, the Klan soon became a vigilante group dedicated to driving blacks out of politics. The Klan spread rapidly throughout the South. Congress attacked the Klan with three Force Acts (1870-1871), which placed elections under federal jurisdiction and punished those
convicted of interfering with any citizen's right to vote. By 1872, federal authorities had broken the power of the Klan. The experience of the Klan, however, demonstrated the effectiveness of terrorism in keeping blacks away from the polls, and paramilitary organizations adopted the tactics the Klan had been forced to abandon. "Conservative" parties (Democratic in national affairs) took over southern governments. Terrorism and intimidation account only in part for this development. Sectional reconciliation and waning interest in policing the South made the North unwilling to intervene.

**Grant as President.** Grant failed to live up to expectations as president. The general was a poor executive; his honest naivete made him the dupe of unscrupulous friends and schemers. He failed to deal effectively with economic and social problems, and corruption plagued his administration. Grant did not cause or participate in the scandals that disgraced his administration, but he did nothing to prevent them. In 1872, Republican reformers, alarmed by rumors of corruption in Grant's administration and by his failure to press for civil service reform, formed the Liberal Republican party and nominated Horace Greeley for president. The Democrats also nominated Greeley, but Grant easily defeated him.

**The Disputed Election of 1876.** In 1876, the Republicans nominated Rutherford B. Hayes, and the Democrats chose Samuel J. Tilden. Early election returns indicated that Tilden led. In Florida, South Carolina, and Louisiana, where Republican regimes still held power, Republicans used their control of the election machinery to invalidate Democratic votes and declare Hayes the winner in those states. In January 1877, Congress created an electoral commission to decide the disputed elections. The Republican majority on the commission awarded the disputed votes to Hayes.

**The Compromise of 1877.** Many southern Democrats were willing to accept Hayes if he would promise to remove federal troops from the South and to allow the southern states to manage their own internal affairs. Once in office, Hayes honored most elements of the compromise. He removed the last troops from South Carolina and Louisiana in April 1877 and appointed a former Confederate general, David M. Key, as Postmaster General. The alliance of ex-Whigs and northern Republicans that produced the compromise did not last. The South remained solidly Democratic. The Compromise of 1877 did, however, mark the end of the Reconstruction era and the recognition of a new political order in the South.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The legal arguments regarding the readmission of southern states.
2. The conflict between Radical Republicans and President Johnson.
3. Black Codes.
4. The provisions and impact of the Fourteenth Amendment.
5. The various Reconstruction Acts passed by Congress.
6. Events leading to the impeachment of Johnson.
7. The Fifteenth Amendment and the circumstances leading to its passage.
8. The accomplishments and failures of "black Reconstruction."
9. How the end of slavery affected the southern economy.
10. The evolution of sharecropping and the crop-lien system and their impact on southern agriculture and the southern economy.
11. The emergence of the Ku Klux Klan.
12. Why the North was unwilling to prevent the disenfranchisement of blacks in the South.
13. The circumstances leading to the Compromise of 1877.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Why did sectional hostilities abate as quickly as they did? What factors led to the reconciliation between the sections?
2. In evaluating the corruption of Reconstruction governments in the South, it might be useful to compare them not only to urban machines in the North but to the conservative governments that replaced "black Republican" rule.
3. How radical, in economic and political terms, were the Radical Republicans?
4. Why was there no significant redistribution of land in the South after the Civil War?
5. Short of mass executions after the war, was there any way to guarantee the rights of blacks and to prevent the return of traditional southern elites to power?

6. What might relations between former masters and former slaves have been like?

5. Given the importance of black voters (see the "Mapping the Past" section), why did Republicans agree to the Compromise of 1877?

6. The “Debating the Past” section poses the question of whether the Reconstruction governments were corrupt. In formulating an answer to that question, consider state and local governments in the North as well as the national government at that time (consult the “Grant as President” section in this chapter and the “City Bosses” section in Chapter 21). What conclusions might one draw from the comparisons?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

As the text points out, carpetbaggers went south for all sorts of reasons. One of the most complex and interesting of them was Albion Winegar Tourgee. He was born in 1838 on a farm in Ohio to a father descended from French Huguenots and a mother from New England. His mother died when he was four, and his father remarried. Albion could not get along with his stepmother and left home. After living with a maternal uncle in Massachusetts, he returned to Ohio in 1854 and taught school. He enrolled at the University of Rochester in 1859.

Tourgee apparently showed little interest in politics before the election of 1860, but he actively supported the Republican party that year. When war broke out, Tourgee enlisted and saw action at Bull Run. In the retreat, the wheel of a gun carriage struck him down, and he suffered a severe injury to his spine. The army discharged him as an invalid. By 1862, however, he returned to the army with a commission. In spite of such apparent determination, Tourgee's military career was less than brilliant. His back continued to give him trouble, and his congenital dislike of authority brought him into conflict with superior officers. He resigned in 1863 after reinjuring his back.

During the war, Tourgee came to believe that the North was fighting for racial equality and not just for the Union. The northern victory, however, seemed to satisfy him. Unlike many Radical Republicans, he did not indicate any concern for establishing a legal or economic basis for the freedom of ex-slaves.

He left Ohio for North Carolina in 1865, not to embark on a crusade, but in search of economic opportunities. By the following year, Tourgee's political awareness grew, as ex-Confederates harassed native unionists and attempted to reduce the freed slaves to peonage.

At this point, Tourgee regarded North Carolina as a society in which the wealthy held dominion over the poor and landless of both races. He advocated the abolition of property qualifications for voting and holding office, improvements in public education, election of judicial officers, and a progressive system of taxation. Historian George Fredrickson has suggested that Tourgee combined two antebellum reform traditions: Jacksonian opposition to "privilege" and abolitionist racial egalitarianism.
North Carolina's "Union party" of 1866, made up primarily of whites who had endorsed antiwar movements during the Civil War, shared some of his reformist tendencies; but Tourgee regarded them as too conservative and unconcerned about blacks. He emerged as the leader of a faction supported largely by northerners, local whites who had not supported the Confederacy, and blacks. Tourgee's proposal to grant the vote to blacks who met the state's property requirement made him obnoxious not only to the conservatives who gained control of the state during presidential Reconstruction, but also to many Unionists.

Radical Reconstruction and the emergence of a Republican party in North Carolina based on black votes thrust Tourgee to the fore. He served as a delegate to the state's constitutional convention in 1868. In the subsequent elections, he won election as a superior court judge. Although savagely attacked by his enemies, Tourgee was an honest, consistent, and courageous judge. His greatest fame derived from his fearless attempts to bring the Ku Klux Klan and its leaders to justice.

In 1879, after conservatives had wrested complete control of the state from the Reconstruction government, Tourgee gave up and returned to the North.

He published *A Fool's Errand*, a novel based closely on his experiences in North Carolina during Reconstruction, in 1879. In the book, he attacked the Klan and criticized Radical Reconstruction for failing to provide an economic base for freedom. Reconstruction failed, according to Tourgee, because of a failure of northern will.

Despite his disappointments, Tourgee did not give up the fight. He became a leader of the National Citizens Rights Association, an organization dedicated to opposing the new segregation laws southern states began to pass in the 1890s. He advocated a policy of testing these laws in court and argued the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* before the United States Supreme Court. Tourgee argued that segregation, on its face, constituted discrimination prohibited by the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court rejected his argument and ruled against Plessy in a decision that gave rise to the "separate but equal" doctrine. Only Justice John Marshall Harlan, a former slaveholder, accepted Tourgee's position.

DOCUMENTS

**Introduction**

In November 1861, the Union army and navy captured the South Carolina Sea Islands just off the coast near Charleston. This minor military victory set the stage for one of the most interesting episodes of the Civil War—"the Port Royal experiment." When the Union forces captured the islands, they captured the rich long-staple cotton plantations abandoned by their owners; they also took control of a large cotton crop and several hundred blacks. These blacks were no longer slaves, but neither were they free; not until after Antietam did Lincoln issue the Emancipation Proclamation.

Abolitionists and philanthropists formed societies in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia to send teachers and labor superintendents to the Sea Islands. These missionaries set up schools and ran plantations on which blacks now worked for wages. Port Royal became the scene of numerous significant "firsts." The first regiment of freed slaves was recruited there. Nowhere else were ex-slaves educated more intensively. Land once owned by planters was sold to former slaves.

The men and women who went to Port Royal were paid $25 to $50 a month by the organizations that sent them. With very few exceptions, these missionaries were motivated by a sincere desire to help the newly freed slaves. In the forbidding climate of the Sea Islands, disease posed a real danger, and the ever-present threat of a Confederate counterattack hung over the missionaries as well. Some found the conditions overwhelming and returned home. Others remained and carried out the Port Royal experiment.

Elizabeth Ware Pearson, the daughter of one of the missionaries and the niece of another, published a collection of letters from Port Royal in 1906.


**Questions for Discussion**

1. From Philbrick's description, how well-equipped do the missionaries seem for the work they have undertaken?

2. What does Harriet Ware's description reveal about the missionaries' attitudes toward blacks? What signs of condescension are apparent? What evidence of genuine sympathy and acceptance do you find? To what degree might the simple fact of a vast cultural difference contribute to misunderstanding?

3. What in Philbrick's description reveals his attitudes about the South?
Edward S. Philbrick to Mrs. Philbrick

New York City, Sunday, March 2 (1862)

We have a rather motley-looking set. A good many look like broken-down schoolmasters or ministers who have excellent dispositions but not much talent. As the kind of talent required where we are going is rather peculiar, the men may be useful, but I don't believe there will be a great deal of cotton raised under their superintendence.

Beaufort, Sunday, March 9

But I can't find any place over ten feet above tide-water, and no hill over six feet high. We all went ashore soon after sunrise and walked about the town, which is laid out in rectangular streets, lined with pleasant but weedy orange-gardens, and often shaded live-oak and sycamore trees. The soil is a fine sand, very like ashes, and the streets are ankle-deep with it already, wherever the grass doesn't grow. Dilapidated fences, tumble-down outbuildings, untrimmed trees with lots of dead branches, weedy walks and gardens and a general appearance of unthrift attendant upon the best of slaveholding towns, was aggravated here by the desolated houses, surrounded by heaps of broken furniture and broken wine and beer bottles which the army had left about after their pillage.

Our quarters are in a very fine house in the east end of the town, bordering on the river, against which is a garden wall, built of oyster-shells and mortar, there being no stone to be had here.
Letter from Harriet Ware

Pine Grove, April 29

Our days pass pretty much after this fashion. Mr. Philbrick gets up about six, calls me, and I obey, having stipulated for a full hour in which to dress. After we get downstairs it takes the united efforts of most of the family to get the breakfast on the table, and we are fortunate if we get up from that meal by half-past eight. It generally consists of hominy, very delicious eaten with either milk, butter, or molasses, corn-cake, or waffles of corn-flour—the best of their kind—concentrated coffee, chocolate, or tea, army bread—when we can get it—crackers, when we can't, and boiled eggs or fried fish, as the case may be. The important operations of dish-washing and arranging the rooms upstairs take longer than you can imagine, and things are not always done when I go to school at ten, which with our simple style of living is rather a nuisance. H. begins to pity the Southern housekeepers. This morning, after making the starch in our little kitchen in the house, she waited about for two hours, before she could get hold of one of the three servants. They were all off at the kitchen, smoking and talking and taking things easy. Joe was nominally cleaning knives, Flora had gone to empty a pail of water, and Sukey had no thought about her starched clothes!...

These people show their subserviency in the way they put Marm or Sir into their sentences every other word and emphasize it as the one important word, and in always agreeing to everything you say. In school it is rather annoying to have them say, "Yes Marm, 'zackly Marm," before it is possible for an idea to have reached their brains.

Flora, our housemaid, who is a character, has a great deal of dignity and influence among the other negroes, and takes the greatest care of us. She is most jealous for what she considers our interests, and moreover is quite an interpreter, though it is hard enough to understand her sometimes....

In the afternoon, as I came out of school, Cuffy said, "You promise to jine praise with we some night dis week, Missus," so I told him I would go up in the evening if Mr. G. would go with me. When we went up after eight they were just lighting the two candles. I sat down on the women's side next a window, and one of the men soon struck up a hymn in which the others joined and which seemed to answer the purpose of a bell, for the congregation immediately began to assemble, and after one or two hymns, Old Peter offered a prayer, using very good language, ending every sentence with "For Jesus' sake." He prayed for us, Massa and Missus, that we might be "boun' up in de belly-band of faith." Then Mr. G. read to them and made a few remarks to which they listened very attentively; then some hymn-singing, Cuffy deaconing out the lines two at a time. Then some one suddenly started up and pronounced a sort of benediction, in which he used the expression "when we done chawing all de hard bones and swallow all de bitter pills." Then they shook hands all round, when one of the young girls struck up one of their wild songs, and we waited listening to them for twenty minutes more. It was not a regular "shout."
CHAPTER 17

In the Wake of the War

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Congress Ascendant. Americans after the Civil War displayed a strongly materialistic bent. They professed a belief in laissez-faire, a policy of government noninterference in business. People tolerated the grossest kind of waste and corruption in high places. Mark Twain described this period as "the Gilded Age" — dazzling on the surface but base metal below. A succession of weak presidents occupied the White House, and Congress dominated the government. Within Congress, the Senate generally overshadowed the House. Critics called the Senate a rich man's club, but its real source of influence derived from the long tenure of many of its members and the small number of senators. Then, too, the House of Representatives was one of the most disorderly and inefficient legislative bodies in the world. Although the Democrats and Republicans competed fiercely, they seldom took clearly opposing positions on the issues of the day. The fundamental division between Democrats and Republicans was sectional, a result of the Civil War. The South was heavily Democratic; New England remained solidly Republican; and the rest of the country was split, although Republicans tended to have the advantage. Wealthy northerners and blacks tended to be Republicans; immigrants and Catholics tended to be Democrats. Even though the Democrats won the presidency only twice, most presidential elections in the late nineteenth century were extremely close, and congressional majorities fluctuated continually.

The Political Aftermath of War. Republicans attacked the Democrats by waving the "bloody shirt" (reminding voters that the Democrats had been the party of secession and that Democrats denied rights to blacks in the South). Union veterans formed the Grand Army of the Republic, which lobbied successfully for benefits for veterans. Other major issues included the tariff, currency, and civil service reform.

Blacks After Reconstruction. Both Republicans and Democrats subscribed to hypocritical statements about black equality and constitutional rights, but neither did anything to implement them. For a time, southern blacks were not totally disfranchised. Rival white political factions tried to manipulate black voters. In the 1890s, however, southern states began to use poll taxes and literacy tests to bar blacks from voting. Supreme Court decisions curtailed black civil rights and the power of the government to defend them. In the Civil Rights Cases (1883), the Court declared the Civil Rights Act of 1875 unconstitutional and ruled that the Fourteenth Amendment guaranteed civil rights against invasion by the state, but not by individuals. Plessy v. Ferguson (1896) upheld the legality of separate public accommodations for blacks and whites, so long as they were of equal quality. In practice, facilities provided for blacks were separate; they were rarely equal.

Booker T. Washington: A "Reasonable" Champion for Blacks. Some blacks responded to racism and discrimination by adopting militant black nationalism; others advocated a revival
of the African colonization movement. Neither of these approaches won many adherents. The dominant black leader of the period, Booker T. Washington, believed that blacks needed to accommodate themselves to white prejudices, at least temporarily, and concentrate on self-improvement. These ideas, expressed in his "Atlanta Compromise" speech, established his reputation as a moderate, "reasonable" black leader. In public, he minimized the importance of civil and political rights; behind the scenes, however, he lobbied against discriminatory measures and financed test cases in the courts.

**White Violence and Vengeance.** For decades after the Civil War, some southern whites had attempted to replace the legal subjugation of slavery with a new form of subjugation based on terror. Between 1890 and 1910, an average of nearly a hundred blacks were lynched each year. Even more striking was the utter savagery of many of the lynchings. Violence succeeded in disfranchising southern black men and driving them out of public spaces. Ironically, this created an opportunity for black women to fill the void created by the disfranchisement of black men. Black women assumed prominent roles as spokespersons in religious and reform associations.

**The West after the Civil War.** There was neither a typical West nor a typical westerner. Many parts of the region had as large a percentage of foreign-born residents as the eastern cities. Although often portrayed as an unpopulated region with large open spaces, the West contained several growing cities, including San Francisco and Denver. If the western economy was predominantly agricultural and extractive, it also had both a commercial and developing industrial component. The West epitomized the social Darwinist psychology of post-Civil War America.

Beginning in the mid-1850s, a steady flow of Chinese immigrated to the United States. Many worked building the railroads. With the completion of the railroads, Chinese began to look elsewhere for work. Workers in San Francisco, who resented the competition, rioted. By 1882, these problems led Congress to prohibit Chinese immigration for ten years; later this ban was extended indefinitely.

**The Plains Indians.** In 1860, the Indians still occupied roughly half the United States; by 1877, they had been shattered as independent peoples. The Plains Indians lived by hunting. They eagerly adopted the products of white culture—clothing, weapons, horses (which became extinct in the Western Hemisphere about 9,000 B.C. and were reintroduced by Cortés). Westward expansion by whites put pressure on Indian lands. In 1851, Thomas Fitzpatrick, an Indian agent, negotiated agreements with several tribes of Plains Indians at Horse Creek, Wyoming. Each tribe agreed to accept definite limits on its hunting grounds. In return, the Indians were promised gifts and annual payments. This policy, known as "concentration," was designed to reduce intertribal warfare and, more important, to enable the government to negotiate separately with each tribe. The United States maintained that each tribe was a sovereign nation, to be dealt with as an equal in treaties, although both sides knew that such was not the case.

**Indian Wars.** White encroachments led to the outbreak of guerrilla warfare, in the course of which both sides committed atrocities. In 1867, the government tried a new strategy to
replace the "concentration" policy. All Indians would be confined to reservations and forced to become farmers. Some Indians refused to yield to the new policy and waged war against both the U.S. Army and settlers. Indians made superb cavalry soldiers and often held off or defeated American troops. Granting the inevitability of white expansion, some version of the "small reservation" policy was probably best for the Indians. However, maladministration hampered the government's policy. Treaties did not provide adequate land for the Indians, and Indian agents often cheated the Indians. The discovery of gold on the Black Hills Indian Reservation led to further fighting, including Custer's defeat at the Little Bighorn.

**The Destruction of Tribal Life.** The bison formed the mainstay of the Indian's food and provided materials for clothing, tools, and shelter. Its destruction led to the disintegration of tribal life. Many whites, including those sympathetic to the Indians' plight, believed that the only way to solve the "Indian problem" was to persuade them to abandon their tribal culture and to live on family farms. The Dawes Severalty Act (1887) allotted tribal lands to individual Indians, provided funds for education, and granted United States citizenship to those who accepted allotments and "adopted the habits of civilized life." Although the bill's sponsors perceived it as a humanitarian reform, it had disastrous results. It shattered what remained of Indian culture without enabling Indians to adapt to white ways.

**The Lure of Gold and Silver in the West.** Americans had long regarded the West as a limitless resource to be exploited. Miners chased "strikes," which gave rise to boom towns, many of which soon died. Major strikes were made at Fraser River, Pikes Peak, and Nevada (the Comstock Lode). The boom towns of the West reflected the get-rich-quick attitude prevalent in the East. Few gave any thought of conserving the resources. Gold towns attracted a wide variety of characters, and law enforcement was a constant problem. Prospectors may have made key discoveries, but larger mining interests developed the resources and made most of the profits. Gold rushes increased interest in the West and generated a valuable literature. Moreover, each new strike and rush, no matter how ephemeral, brought permanent settlers: farmers, cattlemen, storekeepers, lawyers, and ministers. Gold bolstered the financial position of the United States and helped pay for the import of European goods. Gold towns also consumed American agricultural and manufactured goods.

**Big Business and the Land Bonanza.** The Homestead Act (1862) intended to create 160-acre family farms, but things did not work out as planned. Even if land was free, most landless Americans could not afford the cost of moving and purchasing the necessary farm equipment. Factory workers had neither the skills nor the interest to become farmers. Moreover, 160 acres was not sufficient for farms in the far West; the Timber Culture Act (1873) increased the figure to 320 acres and required the planting of trees on the land. Large speculators grabbed much of the land, and private interests destroyed much of the western forests. Some corporate "bonanza" farmers made profits, but even commercialized agriculture could not withstand the droughts of the 1880s.

**Western Railroad Building.** The government subsidized the construction of western railroads through a combination of land grants and loans. Government lands adjacent to the
railroads were not open to homesteading because such free land would prevent the railroads from disposing of their granted lands at good prices. Land grant railroads encouraged the growth of the West by advertising and selling their lands. They also provided inexpensive transportation and shipping for settlers. Corruption and waste often marred the construction of railroads.

**The Cattle Kingdom.** The cattle industry developed as a result of increasing demands for food in eastern cities and the expansion of the railroad network. Cattle were driven from Texas to Sedalia, Abilene, and points westward on the railroads, where the cattlemen sold them for substantial profits. The long drive produced the American cowboy, about a third of whom were black or Mexican. Cattle towns such as Abilene, Wichita, and Dodge City thrived. Life in these towns was neither so violent nor disorderly as legend has it.

**Open-Range Ranching.** Cattlemen began raising stock closer to the railheads, eliminating the long drive. Open-range ranching on the northern plains required little more than the possession of cattle and access to water. The open range made actual ownership of much land unnecessary. Ranchers often banded together to obtain legal title to watercourses and grazed their cattle in common on adjacent lands. Their herds became intermixed and could be distinguished only by brands. Easterners and Europeans invested in the ranches, and a few large ranches eventually came to dominate the industry.

**Barbed Wire Warfare.** By the mid-1880s, crowding on the range and lack of clear land titles gave rise to conflict and violence. Compounding matters, Congress refused to change the land laws and thereby encouraged those who could not get title to enough land legally to resort to fraud. Individuals and groups began to fence off large areas of land they considered their own, a step made possible by the invention of barbed wire. Fencing often led to conflicts. Overproduction drove down beef prices, and many sections were overgrazed. The severe winter of 1886 to 1887 killed between 80-90 percent of cattle on the range and ended open-range cattle ranching. The industry revived on a smaller, more efficient scale.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. Social Darwinism.
2. The major political issues of the "Gilded Age."
3. Factors leading to the disfranchisement of blacks in the South.
5. Federal policy toward the Indians and its impact on tribal life.
6. The impact of western gold mining on the national economy.

7. Why federal land policy did not achieve its purpose.

8. The contribution of railroads to the development of the West.

9. The factors that gave rise to the long drive and its demise.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Why did the political parties fail to confront the major social and economic issues of the late nineteenth century? Consider that both parties were large coalitions with conflicting interests. Consider also that many of the problems were new (industrialization, urbanization, etc.). Is it surprising that answers were not readily available?

2. Compare the myth of the West and its reality.

3. What did two very different acts, the Dawes Act and the Homestead Act, have in common?

4. Did "laissez-faire" really mean that the government did not intervene in the economy?

5. In what ways did Nat Love’s experience reflect larger changes in American and western life described in this chapter? How realistic do some of his claims about his own life seem? Compare, for example, his accounts of violent episodes with the analysis of frontier violence in the “Debating the Past” section.

6. Although he is used to exemplify western violence in the “Debating the Past” section, Jesse James was the product of a particular environment. He began his career as a southern guerrilla fighter under the notorious William Quantrill during the Civil War. Raiding and savage violence broke out in Kansas and Missouri seven years before the Civil War began (see the “Bleeding Kansas” section of chapter 14). Raiding and reprisals continued during the war, and more of this vicious violence took place in Missouri than any other state. By the end of the war, plunder and killing had become a way of life for a group of young men along the Kansas-Missouri border. Considering this background, does the career of Jesse James reveal more about western violence or something else entirely? What might this mean for the debate about the extent and nature of violence in the West?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The text briefly mentions one of the most famous episodes in western history, the Battle of the Little Bighorn. The mystery surrounding the precise events that led to the death
of Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer and his command has contributed to its endless fascination for historians and the public.

The Indians who wiped out Custer and his men were Teton Sioux and Northern Cheyennes. The Sioux had once lived near the headwaters of the Mississippi River; Chippewas armed with muskets obtained from white traders pushed them westward. The Cheyennes also came from further east and moved into the area around the upper Platte River. The Northern Cheyennes migrated northward into territory claimed by the Sioux. These migrations led to conflict with the original claimants to this territory, the Crow. The subsequent migration of whites into the region threatened all of the tribes and led to sporadic, but brutal, warfare.

The Fort Laramie Treaty (1868) ended one round of fighting but laid the groundwork for further trouble. It established all of present South Dakota west of the Missouri River as the Great Sioux Reservation. The Sioux on the reservation would draw rations and provisions from the government. In addition, the government promised to protect the Indians "against the commission of all depredations by people of the United States." Not all Sioux wanted to live on a reservation, and the government agreed to an "unceded" territory from the western boundary of the reservation to the crest of the Big Horn Mountains. There the Indians continued their traditional life of the hunt. These roving bands provided a haven for discontented agency Indians. Many pursued the life of the chase in the summer but opted for the security of government rations in the winter.

The first encroachment onto the unceded territory came from the railroads. Although the Treaty of 1868 permitted railroads, Sioux warriors clashed with soldiers protecting the construction of the Northern Pacific in the Yellowstone Valley.

Real trouble came with rumors of gold in the Black Hills, which were part of the great Sioux Reservation. In 1874, General Philip Sheridan, commander of the Division of the Missouri, sent Custer, in command of the Seventh Cavalry, to explore the Black Hills. The expedition located a site for the military post Sheridan wanted (later to become Fort Meade) and confirmed rumors of gold. Prospectors rushed to the Black Hills, and the government tried vainly both to keep out the prospectors and to purchase the land from the Sioux. The government then turned a blind eye as prospectors entered the Black Hills in search of gold. Indians began raiding mining settlements.

The government issued an ultimatum to the nontreaty Indians: either report to the agencies by January 31, 1876, or be treated as hostiles. The Indians ignored the ultimatum and began to gather under Sitting Bull, Crazy Horse, and Two Moons. At the direction of the government, the army planned a campaign to bring them to heel.

Sheridan ordered three columns to converge on the Indians. One, under Brigadier General George Crook, advanced from the south on the old Bozeman Trail. A second, under Brigadier General Alfred H. Terry, advanced from the east; and the third, commanded by Colonel John Gibbon, left Fort Ellis, near present-day Bozeman, and headed east. Terry, the expedition's commander, joined with Gibbon's column and advanced toward the Upper Rosebud, where he believed the Indians to be located.

Indians surprised Crook's force at the Battle of the Rosebud on June 17, 1876. After six hours of fighting, Crook held the field, but his force had suffered many casualties. He withdrew to the south and effectively removed himself from the campaign.
Terry sent Custer and the Seventh Cavalry on a wide sweep to the south to approach the Indian camp from the opposite direction. His ambiguously worded orders to Custer became the source of endless debate after Custer and his men met with disaster. The plan seemed to call for a coordinated attack on June 26. On June 22, 1876, Custer, 31 officers, 566 enlisted men, and 35 Indian scouts set off to find the Indian camp.

On June 25, Custer located the general vicinity of the Indian camp. Worried that the Indian camp might split up, and perhaps motivated by a desire to gain all the glory for himself and the Seventh Cavalry, he decided not to wait for Terry. He split his force into three. One battalion, under Frederick Benteen, swung to the south. The other two, one under Custer and the other commanded by Major Marcus Reno, advanced along the river. Custer ordered Reno to attack the village. As Reno's battalion advanced, it encountered a large force of Indians. Reno formed a skirmish line, abandoned it, and established a position along the river. He abandoned that position, too, and fled across the river to the bluffs north of the river, where his men took up defensive positions. There Reno was joined by Benteen, who had received written orders from Custer to advance. The two battalions dug in and held the position until the Indians withdrew upon the approach of the columns under Terry and Gibbon.

Custer's precise movements remain uncertain; none of his command survived to tell the tale. He rode along the north side of the river. From the top of a bluff, he got his first view of the enormous Indian camp. After issuing the order for Benteen to "come on" and bring the pack train, Custer advanced and encountered an overwhelming force of Indians. Custer's men retreated to a ridge, where Indian forces led by Gall attacked from the front while groups of Indians under Crazy Horse and Two Moon attacked from the flank and the rear. Custer and all of the men with him were killed.

Advance parties of Gibbon's men discovered Custer's fate. They arrived at "a scene of sickening ghastly horror." In accordance with Indian custom, most of the bodies had been stripped of clothing and mutilated.

The Indian triumph was short-lived. The great Indian encampment split up. Authorized to impose military rule, Sheridan confiscated arms and horses from the Indians at the agencies. A commission demanded and got the "sale" of the Black Hills. Winter campaigns mounted against the Indians took their toll. By spring 1877, hundreds of Indians began to drift onto reservations and agencies. By May, even Crazy Horse surrendered. The great chief, Sitting Bull, vowed never to submit and led a band of roughly four hundred into Canada. In July 1881, Sitting Bull became the last of the major Sioux leaders to surrender.

The campaign of 1876 ultimately accomplished its objectives. The Sioux were forced to abandon the unceded territory and to sell the Black Hills. The Sioux and Cheyennes were forced onto reservations. The last major Sioux uprising had ended.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, black Americans faced growing problems. The North lost interest in protecting black civil rights in the South. The courts had undermined the authority of the federal government to intervene on behalf of blacks, even had it shown any desire to do so. Most blacks, especially in the South, remained poor. By the 1890s blacks had been effectively disfranchised in the South, and racial violence increased alarmingly. "Scientific" racism gained acceptance in all sections of the country.

Black leaders developed different approaches to the manifold problems they faced. Booker T. Washington was born a slave. He taught himself to read and worked his way through Hampton Institute. In 1881, he became the head of a new school for blacks in Tuskegee, Alabama. Washington argued for vocational training for blacks. Such a program did not antagonize the white power structure and provided a basis for economic self-help for blacks. Washington became the most famous and influential black leader of his day.

Although Washington was not so accommodationist as his critics sometimes charged (he helped finance litigation challenging segregation), his approach came in for increasing criticism from some other black leaders, most notably W.E.B. Du Bois. A native of Massachusetts, Du Bois received his Ph.D. from Harvard University in 1895 and made a career as a teacher at Atlanta University. He believed that if blacks prepared themselves only to be farmers, mechanics, and domestics, they would remain forever in such occupations. He began criticizing Washington's program as early as 1903. Du Bois was one of the founders of the Niagara Movement; in 1909, he became a founding member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Du Bois agitated for political rights and for higher education for blacks.

The first document is from Washington's "Atlanta Compromise" speech. The Cotton State Exposition of Industry and the Arts, held in Atlanta in 1895, was designed to encourage diversification of the southern economy. The publishers and bankers who organized the exposition invited Washington to address the mostly white gathering almost as an afterthought. Washington's speech met with overwhelming approval. He received favorable responses from such diverse sources as the editor of the Atlanta Constitution and President Grover Cleveland.

The second document is from "Of Mr. Booker T. Washington and Others," one of the essays in Du Bois's The Souls of Black Folk (1903). In it, he argues that Washington's approach contributed to the loss of political rights, the erection of caste barriers, and the diversion of funds from academic education for talented blacks.


**Questions for Discussion**

1. Did Washington actually propose exchanging black political rights for economic rights?

2. Given the realities of the 1890s, which set of proposals had a more realistic chance for success?

3. To whom did Washington and Du Bois address their remarks?

4. Had blacks adopted Washington's program exclusively, would they have achieved Du Bois's goals? If so, when?

5. How different were the ultimate goals of Washington and Du Bois? Is there a difference between long-term and short-term goals? How does that difference apply to the respective programs proposed by Washington and Du Bois?

6. Who were Washington's benefactors? In what ways did he appeal specifically to them?
Booker T. Washington, Atlanta Exposition Address (1895)

...Ignorant and inexperienced, it is not strange that in the first years of our new life we began at the top instead of at the bottom; that a seat in Congress or the state legislature was more sought than real estate or industrial skill; that the political convention or stump speaking had more attractions than starting a dairy farm or truck garden.

A ship lost at sea for many days suddenly sighted a friendly vessel. From the mast of the unfortunate vessel was seen a signal, "Water, water; we die of thirst!" The answer from the friendly vessel at once came back, "Cast down your bucket where you are."...The captain of the distressed vessel, at last heeding the injunction, cast down his bucket, and it came up full of fresh, sparkling water....To those of my race who underestimate the importance of cultivating friendly relations with the Southern white man, who is their next-door neighbor, I would say: "Cast down your bucket where you are"—cast it down in making friends in every manly way of the people of all races by whom we are surrounded.

Cast it down in agriculture, mechanics, in commerce, in domestic service, and in the professions....Our greatest danger is that in the great leap from slavery to freedom we may overlook the fact that the masses of us are to live by the productions of our hands, and fail to keep in mind that we shall prosper in proportion as we learn to dignify and glorify common labour, and put brains and skill into the common occupations of life....No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem. It is at the bottom of life we must begin, and not at the top.

To those of the white race who look to the incoming of those of foreign birth and strange tongue and habits for the prosperity of the South, were I permitted I would repeat what I say to my own race, "Cast down your bucket where you are." Cast it down among the eight millions of Negroes whose habits you know, whose fidelity and love you have tested in days when to have proved treacherous meant the ruin of your firesides. Cast down your bucket among these people who have, without strikes and labour wars, tilled your fields, cleared your forests, builded your railroads and cities, and brought forth treasures from the bowels of the earth....Casting down your bucket among my people...you will find that they will buy your surplus land, make blossom the waste places in your fields, and run your factories. While doing this, you can be sure in the future, as in the past, that you and your families will be surrounded by the most patient, faithful, law-abiding, and unresentful people that the world has seen....In all things that are purely social we can be as separate as the finders, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress....

The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercise of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera-house.
Easily the most striking thing in the history of the American Negro since 1876 is the ascendancy of Mr. Booker T. Washington....His programme of industrial education, conciliation of the South, and submission and silence as to civil and political rights was not wholly original....But Mr. Washington first indissolubly linked these things; he changed it from a by-path into a veritable Way of Life....

Mr. Washington represents in Negro thought the old attitude of adjustment and submission; but adjustment at such a peculiar time as to make his programme unique. This is an age of unusual economic development, and Mr. Washington's programme naturally takes an economic cast, becoming a gospel of Work and Money to such an extent as apparently almost completely to overshadow the higher aims of life....Mr. Washington's programme practically accepts the alleged inferiority of the Negro races....In the history of nearly all other races and peoples the doctrine preached at such crises has been that manly self-respect is worth more than lands and houses, and that a people who voluntarily surrender such respect, or cease striving for it, are not worth civilizing.

...Mr. Washington distinctly asks that black people give up, at least for the present, three things,—

First, political power.
Second, insistence on civil rights.
Third, higher education of Negro youth,

...The question then comes: Is it possible, and probable, that nine millions of men can make effective progress in economic lines if they are deprived of political rights, made a servile caste, and allowed only the most meagre chance for developing their exceptional men? If history and reason give any distinct answer to these questions, it is an emphatic No....

...while it is a great truth to say that the Negro must strive and strive mightily to help himself, it is equally true that unless his striving be not simply seconded, but rather aroused and encouraged, by the initiative of the richer and wiser environing group, he cannot hope for great success.

...So far as Mr. Washington preaches Thrift, Patience, and Industrial Training for the masses, we must hold up his hands and strive with him, rejoicing in his honors and glorying in the strength of this Joshua called of God and of man to lead the headless host. But so far as Mr. Washington apologizes for injustice, North or South, does not rightly value the privilege and duty of voting, belittles the emasculating effects of caste distinctions, and opposes the higher training and ambition of our brighter minds,—so far as he, the South, or the Nation, does this, we must unceasingly and firmly oppose them.
CHAPTER 18
An Industrial Giant

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Essentials of Industrial Growth. American manufacturing flourished in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. New natural resources were discovered and exploited, creating opportunities that attracted the brightest and most energetic Americans. The national market grew, protected from foreign competition by tariffs, and foreign capital entered the market freely. European immigrants provided the additional labor needed for industrial expansion. Advances in science and technology created new machines and power sources, which increased productivity.

Railroads: The First Big Business. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, railroads were probably the most significant element in American economic development. Important as an industry themselves, railroads also contributed to the growth and development of other industries. Railroads developed into larger and more integrated systems, and their executives, including Cornelius Vanderbilt and Jay Gould, became some of the most powerful and wealthiest people in the country. Railroad equipment became standardized, as did time zones. Land grant railroads helped to settle the West by selling their lands cheaply and on easy terms to settlers. New railroad technology, including the air brake and more powerful locomotives, made it possible for larger trains to travel at faster speeds.

Iron, Oil, and Electricity. The transformation of iron manufacturing affected the United States almost as much as the development of railroads. New techniques, including the Bessemer process, made possible the mass production of steel. The huge supply of iron ore and coal in the United States allowed for rapid growth of steel production. The Mesabi range yielded enormous quantities of easily mined iron. Pittsburgh, surrounded by vast coal deposits, became the iron and steel center of the country. The petroleum industry expanded even more spectacularly than iron and steel. New refining techniques enabled refiners to increase the production of kerosene, which, until the development of the gasoline engine, was the most important petroleum product. Technological advances and the growth of an urban society led to the creation of new industries, such as the telephone and electric light businesses. Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone in 1876, and his invention quickly proved its practical value. Of all Edison's many inventions, the most significant was the incandescent light bulb. The Edison Illuminating Company opened a power station in New York, and power stations began to appear everywhere. The substitution of electric for steam power in factories had an impact comparable to the substitution of steam for water power before the Civil War.

Competition and Monopoly: The Railroads. The growing importance of expensive machinery and economies of scale led to economic concentration. Deflationary pressures after 1873 led to falling prices and increased competition, which cut deeply into railroad
profits. Railroads attempted to increase the volume of shipping by giving rebates, drawbacks, and other discounts to selected customers. Sometimes these discounts were far beyond what the economies of bulk shipment justified; in order to make up these losses, railroads charged higher rates in areas where no competition existed. The combination of lost revenue from rate cutting and inflated debts forced several railroads into receivership in the 1870s. In the 1880s, the major railroads responded to those pressures by creating interregional systems. These became the first giant corporations.

**Competition and Monopoly: Steel.** The iron and steel industry was also intensely competitive; production continued to increase, but demand varied erratically. Andrew Carnegie used his talents as a salesman and administrator, along with his belief in technological improvements, to create the Carnegie Steel Company, which dominated the industry. Alarm ed by Carnegie's control of the industry, makers of finished steel products considered combining their resources and making steel themselves. In response, Carnegie threatened to turn out finished products. J. P. Morgan averted a steel war by buying out Carnegie, his main competitor, and the main fabricators of finished products. The new combination, United States Steel, was the first billion-dollar corporation. Carnegie retired to devote his life to philanthropy.

**Competition and Monopoly: Oil.** Intense competition among refiners led to combination and monopoly in the petroleum industry. John D. Rockefeller founded the Standard Oil Company in 1870. He used technological advances and employed both fair and unfair means to destroy his competition or to persuade them to join forces with him. By 1879, Rockefeller controlled 90 percent of the nation's oil refining capacity. To maintain his monopoly, Rockefeller developed a new type of business organization, the trust.

**Competition and Monopoly: Retailing and Utilities.** Utilities, such as the telephone and electric lighting industries, also formed monopolies in order to prevent costly duplication of equipment and to protect patents. Bell and Edison fought lengthy and expensive court battles to defend their inventions from imitators and competitors. Competition between General Electric Company and Westinghouse dominated the electric lighting industry. The life insurance business expanded after the Civil War, and it, too, became dominated by a few large companies. In retailing, this period saw the emergence of urban department stores, including Wanamaker's and Marshall Field. The department stores advertised heavily and stressed low prices, efficient service, and guaranteed products.

**American Ambivalence to Big Business.** The expansion of industry and its concentration in fewer hands changed the way many people felt about the role of government in economic and social affairs. Americans professed to believe that the government should not intervene in the economy, a policy known as laissez-faire. Certain intellectual currents encouraged this approach. By the 1870s, Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species* and its theory of natural selection exercised a powerful influence on American public opinion. Some theorists, such as William Graham Sumner of Yale, applied Darwin's theory to social and economic interactions. Although Americans disliked powerful government and strict regulation of the economy, they did not object to all government involvement in the economic sphere. The
growth of huge industrial and financial organizations frightened many people. At the same
time, people wanted the goods and services big business produced. The public worried that
monopolists would raise prices; still more significant was the fear that monopolies would
destroy economic opportunity and threaten democratic institutions.

Reformers: George, Bellamy, Lloyd. The popularity of several reformers reflected the
growing concern over the maldistribution of wealth and the power of corporations. In
Progress and Poverty (1879), Henry George argued that labor was the only true source of
capital. He proposed a "single tax" on wealth produced by appreciation of land values.
Edward Bellamy's utopian novel, Looking Backward (1888), described a future in which
America was completely socialized and carefully planned. Bellamy's ideal socialist state
arrived without revolution or violence. Henry Demarest Lloyd's Wealth Against
Commonwealth (1894) denounced the Standard Oil Company. His forceful but
uncomplicated arguments made Lloyd's book convincing to thousands. Despite their
criticisms, these writers did not question the underlying values of the middle-class majority,
and they insisted that reform could be accomplished without serious inconvenience to any
individual or class.

Reformers: The Marxists. By the 1870s, the ideas of the Marxian socialists began to
penetrate the United States. The Marxist Socialist Labor party was founded in 1877.
Laurence Gronlund's The Cooperative Commonwealth (1884) attempted to explain Marxism
to Americans. The leading voice of the Socialist Labor party, Daniel De Leon, was a
doctrinaire revolutionary who insisted that workers could improve their lot only by adopting
socialism and joining the Socialist Labor party. He paid scant attention to the opinions or to
the practical needs of common working people.

The Government Reacts to Big Business: Railroad Regulation. Political reaction to the
growth of big business came first at the state level and dealt chiefly with the regulation of
railroads. Strict railroad regulation resulted largely from agitation by the National Grange and
focused on establishing reasonable maximum rates and outlawing unjust price discrimination.
In Munn v. Illinois (1877), the Supreme Court ruled that such regulations by states were
constitutional when applied to businesses that served a public interest. However, the
Supreme Court declared invalid an Illinois law prohibiting discriminatory rates between long
and short hauls in the Wabash case (1886) on the ground that a state could not regulate
interstate commerce. The following year, Congress passed the Interstate Commerce Act,
which required that railroad charges be reasonable and just. It also outlawed rebates,
drawbacks, and other competitive practices. In addition, the act created the Interstate
Commerce Commission, the first federal regulatory board, to supervise railroad regulation.

The Government Reacts to Big Business: The Sherman Antitrust Act. The first antitrust
legislation originated in the states. Federal action came with the passage of the Sherman
Antitrust Act (1890), which declared illegal trusts or other combinations in restraint of trade
or commerce. The Interstate Commerce Act sought to outlaw the excesses of competition;
the Sherman Act intended to restore competition. The Supreme Court undermined the
Sherman Act when it ruled that the American Sugar Refining Company, which controlled 98
percent of sugar refining, was engaged in manufacturing and therefore its dominance did not restrict trade. In later cases, however, the Court ruled that agreements to fix prices did violate the Sherman Act.

The Labor Union Movement. At the time of the Civil War, only a small percentage of American workers were organized, and most union members were skilled artisans, not factory workers. The growth of national craft unions quickened after 1865. The National Labor Union was founded in 1866, but its leaders were out of touch with the practical needs and aspirations of workers. They opposed the wage system, strikes, and anything that increased laborers' sense of membership in the working class. Their major objective was the formation of worker-owned cooperatives. Founded in 1869, the Knights of Labor supported political objectives that had little to do with working conditions and rejected the idea that workers must resign themselves to remaining wage earners. The Knights also rejected the grouping of workers by crafts and accepted blacks, women, and immigrants. Membership in the Knights grew in the 1880s, encouraged by successful strikes against railroads. In 1886, agitation for an eight-hour day gained wide support. Clashes between workers and police in Chicago led to a protest meeting at Haymarket Square. A bomb tossed into the crowd killed seven policemen and injured many others.

The American Federation of Labor. The violence in Chicago damaged organized labor, especially the Knights of Labor, which the public associated with anarchy and violence. Membership in the Knights declined. A combination of national craft unions, the American Federation of Labor, replaced the Knights of Labor as the leading labor union. Led by Adolph Strasser and Samuel Gompers, the AFL concentrated on organizing skilled workers. It fought for higher wages and shorter hours. The AFL accepted the fact that most workers would remain wage earners and used its organization to develop a sense of common purpose and pride among its members. The AFL avoided direct involvement in politics and used the strike as its primary tool to improve working conditions.

Labor Militancy Rebuffed. Threatened by the growing size and power of their corporate employers, the substitution of machines for human skills, and the influx of foreign workers willing to accept low wages, labor grew increasingly militant. In 1877, a railroad strike shut down two-thirds of the nation's railroad mileage. Violence broke out, federal troops restored order, and the strike collapsed. In 1892, violence marked the strike against Carnegie's Homestead Steel plant. The defeat of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers eliminated unionism as an effective force in the steel industry. The most important strike of the period took place in 1894, when Eugene Debs's American Railway Union struck the Pullman company. President Cleveland broke the strike when he sent federal troops to ensure the movement of the mail. When Debs defied a federal injunction to end the strike, he was jailed for contempt.

Whither America, Whither Democracy? Each year more of America's wealth and power seemed to fall into fewer hands. Bankers dominated major industries. Centralization increased efficiency but raised questions about the ultimate effects of big business on democracy. The defeat of the Pullman strike demonstrated the power of courts to break
strikes. The federal government obtained an injunction in that case by asserting that the American Railway Union was engaged in a combination in restraint of trade prohibited by the Sherman Act. After the failure of the Pullman strike, Debs became a socialist.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The factors that contributed to industrial growth in the late nineteenth century.

2. The impact of railroads on the American economy.

3. The importance of technological developments in the railroad, steel, petroleum, telephone, and electric light industries.

4. The impact of competition and deflation on the pricing practices of railroads.

5. The forces leading to economic concentration in industry.

6. Americans' ambivalent reactions to big business.

7. The different approaches taken by various reformers and critics of big business.


9. The role of the courts in shaping government regulation of business.

10. The growth of the union movement after the Civil War.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Why were Americans so alarmed at the growth of big business? Consider that no other western country made antitrust a major issue. What were the implications of big business for American individualism? American concepts of equality? American democracy?

2. However alarming Americans found the arrival of large corporations, they enjoyed the benefits. What effect did big business have on prices? Were fears of monopoly pricing borne out?

3. Compare the AFL's trade unionism with reformist unions such as the Knights of Labor and the National Labor Union. What are some of the drawbacks to the AFL's pragmatic trade unionism?

4. Based on the information in the "Mapping the Past" section, evaluate how important railroads were to economic development in the late nineteenth century.

5. The “Debating the Past” section juxtaposes Alfred D. Chandler’s work against Olivier Zunz’s. Chandler maintains that the greatest contribution of the industrialists was the complex administrative structures of business they created, which enabled businesses to expand in geographic scope and to integrate vertically (see the Lecture Supplement in this chapter). How might one reconcile this interpretation with Zunz’s?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The first step to understanding the impact of big business on American society is to understand exactly what big business was. In the decades after the Civil War, it generally meant railroads, manufacturing corporations, and banks. These businesses were totally different creations from earlier forms of business. They performed different functions and did so in different ways. Moreover, their organizational structures were different from earlier forms of business.

To begin with, big businesses required larger pools of capital. Before the Civil War, businesses generally were financed by an individual or several partners. Manufacturing required relatively little investment in the physical plant or expensive machinery. Technological advances changed all that in the late nineteenth century. The capital accumulations necessary in the second half of the century dwarfed anything of the first half of the century. This made it impossible to capitalize without gathering money from a large number of people, which led to the sale of stock, by which individuals bought a share of the company and shared in the profits. The huge requirements of capital altered the assumption that anyone could go into business. No individual, based on his credit and that of a few friends, could reasonably hope to compete with United States Steel, capitalized at over one billion dollars.
Another distinction between big business and earlier forms of enterprise related to the kinds of costs. Businesses distinguish between fixed costs, which apply whether the firm is operating or not (taxes, capital investment, interest, etc.), and working or variable costs, which are directly related to the production of goods (wages, salaries, raw materials). The relatively small manufacturing concerns of the early nineteenth century operated with low fixed costs; operating costs made up the greatest part of the cost of production. This made it relatively easy to ride out a depression by closing down. The physical plant did not represent much investment; it was no real tragedy to see it idle. The large-scale enterprises of the late nineteenth century, however, often depended on advanced technology and an expensive physical plant, which represented great constant, or fixed, cost. Because the fixed cost was so high, it often became more costly to stop production than to produce at a loss. This influenced the behavior of big businesses, which required a stable market because of the high fixed costs. Thus, high fixed costs and the resulting search for stable markets contributed to the drive for monopoly.

The nature of ownership changed with the arrival of big business. Earlier businesses were owned by an individual or by several partners. In most cases the owner or partners also functioned as managers. Big business meant a separation of ownership and management. The vast number of shareholders could not manage the day-to-day business of the corporation; therefore, they gave control to an individual, a manager. As the complexity of business grew, big business gave rise to a new class of professionals involved in the management of the operation.

Big business also represented a change in the geographic scale on which business operated. Earlier forms of business were local. Very few manufacturers or retailers had contacts outside their immediate area of business. Even merchants and bankers with contacts in other cities operated on a relatively restricted scale. Big business operated in a great number of locations on a national scale.

Big business also consolidated functions. In the first half of the century, merchants, wholesalers, and manufacturers grew increasingly specialized. Big business consolidated all of these functions. The Swift meat packing company, for instance, combined the previously separate functions of slaughtering, butchering, transporting, and wholesale marketing.

Consolidation comes about through two means: vertical integration and horizontal integration. Vertical integration is expansion forward or backward in the production process. Forward vertical integration moves a business's activities closer to marketing. Backward vertical integration moves the company's activities closer to the raw materials. Using the Carnegie Steel Company for an example, forward vertical integration would have meant developing its own sales force; backward integration would have meant obtaining control over raw materials. Full vertical integration would be control of every stage of production from obtaining raw materials to wholesale, or even retail, sales. Horizontal integration refers to expanding control at the same stage of production. Standard Oil's expansion to control much of the oil refining business would be an example of horizontal integration.

Big business also differed from earlier forms of business in structure. Improvements in transportation and communications as well as technological advances in production contributed to the formation of big business. However, the structures created to take advantage of these other factors made the modern corporation possible. Smaller businesses of the earlier period required relatively simple administrative networks. A few journeymen or
clerks ordinarily sufficed. Even pre-Civil War factories needed only a manager or foreman. Banks or merchants with interests in several locations usually ensured their interests by placing a relative in charge. Big business, on the other hand, required the creation of an elaborate, formal administrative network with clear lines of authority. Such structures made possible the complex operation of a vertically integrated corporation.

Finally, big business created wealth on a scale that dwarfed anything that came before. The owners and managers of these huge business institutions now made decisions that directly affected the lives of thousands. Their wealth gave them power and influence. With the arrival of big business, older means of doing things would no longer do. The arrival of big business profoundly altered social and political, as well as economic, life in America. Much of the history of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is the adjustment to this new creation.

American intellectuals often responded suspiciously to the new industrial order. The text discusses Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888), the story of Julian West, a wealthy young Bostonian who enters a hypnotic sleep in 1887 and awakes 113 years later. In the society to which he awakens, the squalor of Boston's slums has been replaced by "a great city," made up of "miles of broad streets, shaded by trees and lined with fine buildings." The injustice of the industrial system has given way to a socialist utopia. The business monopolies of the late nineteenth century have evolved into one great trust, and the nation has taken over that trust. All of these changes have occurred without violence. "Credit cards" give each citizen an equal share of the goods created by the new society. The collective society has eradicated crime, poverty, warfare, and advertising. Everyone receives a liberal education and can choose his or her career. Less appealing or more arduous tasks are filled voluntarily, because people filling them work shorter hours and under good conditions.

Bellamy's book was a huge success. Its publisher, Houghton Mifflin, proudly proclaimed, "Of only one other book have 300,000 copies been printed within two years of its publication." (*Uncle Tom's Cabin* was the other.) *Looking Backward* inspired the formation of 150 Nationalist Clubs throughout the country. Their purpose was to turn Bellamy's ideas into reality. The key to Bellamy's book was its inclusion of most of the reform ideas of his generation and the presentation of a society based on such ideas in a nonthreatening form.

The creation of enormous new fortunes also evoked hostility from established elites. Older (and often less wealthy) families found the new rich to be vulgar, crass, and a threat to manners and civility. The most respected literary man of his day, William Dean Howells, frequently dealt with the interaction of the new rich and established society. His classic novel, *The Rise of Silas Lapham* (1885), tells the story of a self-made businessman, Silas Lapham, who has aspirations to enter Boston society. Tom Corey, a Brahmin, goes to work for Silas and falls in love with one of Silas's daughters. Howells indicates a distaste for the crude, boastful, and boorish Silas and admiration for the culture and gentility of the Coreys. At the same time, however, when Silas is faced with financial ruin, he accepts bankruptcy rather than cheat unwary investors. He returns to his farm in Vermont in comfortable, but greatly reduced, circumstances. His daughter marries Tom, and they move to Mexico to escape the social distance between their families. Thus, Howells is not entirely unsympathetic to the Laphams; he admires Silas's hard work and straightforward manner. Neither is he uncritical of the snobbish pretensions of the upper class. He often makes such points through the bemused observations of Bromfield Corey, Tom's father.

For further reading, see Edward Bellamy, *Looking Backward*; William Dean Howells, *The Rise of Silas Lapham* and *A Hazard of New Fortunes*.
Questions for Discussion

1. Both Howells and Bellamy dealt with the question of how society would adjust to the new industrial order. Which was more optimistic about the prospects of satisfactory adjustment?

2. What trends evident by the late nineteenth century does Bellamy regard as harbingers of the future? How did this contribute to the credibility of his book? To what extent might this account for the book's extraordinary popularity?

3. What concerns about the arrival of a class of newly rich industrialists does Bromfield Corey represent? Is Corey really hostile? Might some others have been far more so?
I myself was rich and also educated, and possessed, therefore, all the elements of happiness enjoyed by the most fortunate in that age. Living in luxury, and occupied only with the pursuit of the pleasures and refinements of life, I derived the means of my support from the labor of others, rendering no sort of service in return. My parents and grand-parents lived in the same way, and I expected that my descendants, if I had any, would enjoy a like easy existence.

...This mystery of use without consumption, of warmth without combustion, seems like magic, but was merely an ingenious application of the art now happily lost but carried to a great perfection by your ancestors, of shifting the burden of one's support on the shoulders of others. The man who had accomplished this, and it was the end all sought, was said to live on the income of his investments.... I shall only stop now to say that interest on investments was a species of tax in perpetuity upon the product of those engaged in industry which a person possessing or inheriting money was able to levy....

"I would give a great deal for just one glimpse of the Boston of your day," replied Dr. Leete. "No doubt, as you imply, the cities of that period were rather shabby affairs. If you had the taste to make them splendid, which I would not be so rude as to question, the general poverty resulting from your extraordinary industrial system would not have given you the means. Moreover, the excessive individualism which then prevailed was inconsistent with much public spirit. What little wealth you had seems almost wholly to have been lavished in private luxury. Nowadays, on the contrary, there is no destination of the surplus wealth so popular as the adornment of the city, which all enjoy in equal degree."...

"As no such thing as the labor question is known nowadays," replied Dr. Leete, "and there is no way in which it could arise, I suppose we may claim to have solved it....The solution came as the result of a process of industrial evolution which could not have terminated otherwise. All that society had to do was to recognize and cooperate with that evolution, when its tendency had become unmistakable."...

"Meanwhile, without being in the smallest degree checked by the clamor against it, the absorption of business by ever larger monopolies continued. In the United States there was not, after the beginning of the last quarter of the century, any opportunity whatever for individual enterprise in any important field of industry, unless backed by great capital. During the last decade of the century, such small businesses as still remained were fast-failing survivals of a past epoch....The railroads had gone on combining till a few great syndicates controlled every rail in the land. In manufactories, every important staple was controlled by a syndicate. These syndicates, pools, trusts, or whatever their name, fixed prices and crushed all competition except when combinations as vast as themselves arose. Then a struggle, resulting in still greater consolidation, ensued.
...The movement toward the conduct of business by larger and larger aggregations of capital, the tendency toward monopolies, which had been so desperately and vainly resisted, was recognized at last, in its true significance, as a process which only needed to complete its logical evolution to open a golden future to humanity.

Early in the last century the evolution was completed by the final consolidation of the entire capital of the nation. The industry and commerce of the country, ceasing to be conducted by a set of irresponsible corporations and syndicates of private persons at their caprice and for their profit, were intrusted to a single syndicate representing the people, to be conducted in the common interest for the common profit. The nation, that is to say, organized as the one great business corporation in which all other corporations were absorbed...."
"Will they be a great addition to society?" asked Bromfield Corey, with unimpeachable seriousness.

"I don't quite know what you mean," returned the son, a little uneasily.

"Ah, I see that you do, Tom."

"No one can help feeling that they are all people of good sense and—right ideas."

"Oh, that won't do. If society took in all the people of right ideas and good sense, it would expand beyond the calling capacity of its most active members. Even your mother's social conscientiousness could not compass it. Society is a very different sort of thing from good sense and right ideas. It is based upon them, of course, but the airy, graceful, winning superstructure which we all know demands different qualities. Have your friends got these qualities—which may be felt, but not defined?"

The son laughed. "To tell you the truth, sir, I don't think they have the most elemental ideas of society, as we understand it. I don't believe Mrs. Lapham ever gave a dinner."

"And with all that money!" sighed the father.

"I don't believe they have the habit of wine at table. I suspect that when they don't drink tea and coffee with their dinner, they drink ice water."

"Horrible!" said Bromfield Corey.

"It appears to me that this defines them."

"Oh yes. There are people who give dinners, and who are not cognoscible. But people who have never given a dinner, how is society to assimilate them?"

"It digests a great many people," suggested the young man.

"Yes; but they have always brought some sort of sauce piquante with them. Now, as I understand you, these friends of yours have not such sauce."

"Oh, I don't know about that!" cried the son.

"Oh, rude, native flavors, I dare say. But that isn't what I mean. Well, then, they must spend. There is no other way for them to win their way to general regard. We must have the Colonel elected to the Ten O'clock Club, and he must put himself down in the list of those willing to entertain. Anyone can manage a large supper. Yes, I see a gleam of hope for him in that direction!"

In the morning Bromfield Corey asked his son whether he should find Lapham at his place as early as eleven.

"I should think you might find him even earlier. I've never been there before him. I doubt if the porter is there much sooner."

"Well, suppose I go with you, then?"

"Why, if you like, sir," said the son, with some deprecation.

"Oh, the question is, will he like?"

"I think he will, sir," and the father could see that his son was very much pleased
CHAPTER 19

American Society in the Industrial Age

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Middle-Class Life. Americana middle-class culture took elements of romanticism (the optimism about human potential, the quest for personal improvement, the passion for competition) and tempered them with self-control. Victorian family relations, however, were not nearly so stiff and formal as often imagined. Diaries and letters indicate that many couples experienced sexually fulfilling relationships. Middle-class families also began to have fewer children. Abstinence accounted for much of the decline in fertility, but the use of contraceptive devices and abortion contributed as well. Children in these families were treasured and closely supervised. America's middle class comprised professionals, varied groups of shopkeepers, small manufacturers, skilled craftsmen, and established farmers. Middle-class family life was defined in terms of tangible goods, thus giving rise to a culture of consumption.

Skilled and Unskilled Workers. Wage earners, especially in the mining, manufacturing, and transportation sectors, experienced the full impact of industrialization. Skilled industrial workers were generally quite well off, but unskilled laborers found it difficult to support a family on their wages alone. As machines replaced human skills, jobs became monotonous. Further, work became more regulated as machines set the pace of work, and the time clock marked the work day. Large-scale industry decreased contact between employee and employer; relations between them became increasingly impersonal. The costs of capitalization reduced the worker's opportunity to rise from the ranks of labor to ownership. Workers became subject to swings of the business cycle.

Working Women. With the shift from cottage industries to a factory system, a growing number of women worked outside of the home. While many women found work in the textile mills and the sewing trades, at least half of all working women were employed as domestic servants. The Cult of True Womanhood served to open new employment opportunities for women. Employers in the retail sector believed women to be more polite, honest, and submissive than male workers. For many of these same reasons, educated middle-class women came to dominate the nursing, elementary education, and secretarial fields. Although employment opportunities for women increased during this period, management and entrepreneurial positions remained, for the most part, a male domain.

Farmers. Long the mainstay of American society, independent farmers found their relative share of the nation's wealth and their personal status declining. Loss of wealth and influence, along with an increasing vulnerability to an economy dominated by industrial trends, fostered periodic waves of radicalism in the nation's farm belts. While the Grange movements took hold at different times in different places and varied in their impact, they were instrumental in breaking down rural laissez-faire prejudices. Farmers in the older, more established regions benefited not only from new technology, but from easy access to rapidly expanding urban
markets. The frontier farm belts and the Old South proved less able to adapt to new technologies and advances in transportation.

**Working-Class Family Life.** Enormous disparities existed in the standard of living among workers engaged in the same line of work during this period. Co-workers with the same pay rates often supported their families in dramatically different styles. The factors influencing a working-class family could range from family size to personal spending habits. Social workers of the day listed such variables as family health, intelligence, the wife's household management skills, the family's commitment to middle-class values, and pure luck.

**Working-Class Attitudes.** Surveys conducted among workers during the 1880s and 1890s revealed a broad spectrum of responses regarding their employment circumstances. While some workers expressed contentment with their conditions, others called for the nationalization of the means of production and transportation. Despite a general improvement in living standards, the number of bitter strikes revealed the discontent of many workers. This dissatisfaction fell into three broad areas. For some, poverty remained the chief problem. For others, rising aspirations triggered discontent. The discontent of yet another group stemmed from confusion over their situation; the tradition that no one of ability need remain a hired hand died hard, even in the face of contradictory reality. They were drawn to the ideas of a classless society and the community of interest shared by capital and labor, but the gap between the very rich and ordinary citizens was widening.

**Working Your Way Up.** Americans were a mobile people. Geographical mobility often translated into economic and social improvement. Nearly one quarter of all manual laborers studied rose into the ranks of the middle class. While such upward progress was primarily the result of economic growth, public education began to provide an additional boost. By the turn of the century, more than 15 million students attended public schools, curricula had expanded, and as many as 36 cities had established vocational high schools.

**The "New" Immigration.** Between 1866 and 1915, about 25 million immigrants entered the United States. The demand for labor created by industrial expansion drew immigrants, and steamships made the Atlantic crossing safe and speedy. Economic disruption in many European countries, political upheaval, and religious persecution pushed this wave of immigrants to America's shores. Prior to the 1880s, the bulk of America's newcomers were western and northern Europeans. Beginning in the 1880s, the sources of immigration shifted from northern and western to southern and eastern Europe.

**New Immigrants Face New Nativism.** Linguistic, religious, and cultural factors, along with the physical appearance of these new immigrants, convinced many Americans that these new arrivals would not assimilate into mainstream society. Old stock American workers, in addition to their existing prejudices, worried that these new immigrants undermined their job security. The majority of these "new immigrants" settled into ethnic enclaves. Political nativists, social Darwinists, and pseudo-scientists found the flow of immigrants alarming. Labor leaders feared competition for jobs. Employers were not disturbed by the influx of workers, but many became alarmed by the supposed radicalism of the immigrants. There
were some efforts to limit immigration, but substantial immigration controls were not enacted until after World War I.

**The Expanding City and Its Problems.** Proponents of immigration restriction made much of the crowded ethnic enclaves in the cities. Immigrants were drawn to cities by the jobs created by expanding industry, as were native-born Americans. Industrialization alone did not account for the growth of the cities. Urban centers served as commercial and transportation hubs. By the end of the century, however, the expansion of industry had become the chief cause of urban growth. Immigrants made up a steadily increasing proportion of the urban population. Few had the resources to acquire land and farm implements. As the concentration progressed, eastern cities developed ethnic neighborhoods. These neighborhoods helped preserve traditional cultures. Many native-born citizens resented the newcomers and accused them of resisting Americanization.

**Teeming Tenements.** The rapid rate of city growth severely taxed, and in many cases overwhelmed, local infrastructures. The problems of sewage and garbage disposal, fire protection, law enforcement, and the availability of potable water supplies often reached crisis stage. Overcrowding and substandard housing led to epidemics, crime, juvenile delinquency, and, at times, to the disintegration of family life. Efforts to enact new building codes and to design new modes of urban housing effected little real improvement. Slums bred crime, and the more affluent fled to suburbs.

**The Cities Modernize.** Eventually the problems confronting the nation's cities began to yield to solutions. Technology contributed some of the answers. The development of electric trolley lines not only allowed a city to expand outward but also eliminated much of the organic pollution of horsepower. Improvements in street paving and electric lighting enhanced urban life. New materials and new architectural design allowed cities to grow upward. Despite these technical aids and the actions of urban reformers, the lot of the cities' poorest denizens remained much the same.

**Leisure Activities: More Fun and Games.** The concentration of people in the burgeoning cities fostered many kinds of social, intellectual, and artistic activity impossible to maintain in rural areas. In addition to the museums and concert halls of the upper classes, city life also spawned vaudeville, burlesque houses, and the workingman's saloon. Family activities could center around parks and amusement parks reached by trolley. Bicycling, golf, and tennis gained popularity. Cities provided the concentrations of population necessary to maintain spectator sports such as boxing, baseball, football, and basketball.

**Christianity's Conscience and the Social Gospel.** The traditional conservative attitudes of many churches and their leaders offered little practical help to urban slum dwellers. Many residents of the poorer districts were Roman Catholic; and, while the Church distributed aid to the poor, it remained unconcerned with the social causes of poverty. Urban evangelists such as Dwight L. Moody urged slum dwellers to cast aside their sinful ways. However, they, too, paid little attention to the causes of urban poverty and vice. A few nontraditional, primarily Protestant, clergymen began to preach a "Social Gospel" that focused on improving
the living conditions of the poor, rather than on purely spiritual matters. The most influential of these was Washington Gladden.

**The Settlement Houses.** The Social Gospel movement was, for the most part, inspirational. A number of concerned people founded community centers known as settlement houses. The settlement house, constructed in the poorer districts and run by upper- and middle-class volunteers (most of whom were women), provided guidance, educational services, and legal advice to their clientele. The volunteers not only provided lessons in home economics and English, but also lobbied local and state governments for tenement housing laws and the construction of schools. The overall goal was to improve the plight of the disadvantaged while aiding them in assimilating into mainstream society.

**Civilization and Its Discontents.** Those Americans fortunate enough to be spared the more unpleasant disruptions of industrial development by wealth, social status, or geographic isolation remained uncritical of their civilization. However, blacks, many immigrants, the poor, and a growing segment of reformers found much to lament in American society. Many were troubled by the increasing gap between rich and poor. Others worried that crass materialism would overwhelm traditional and spiritual values.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The advantages and disadvantages of the new industrial system for workers.

2. The changes in middle-class life.

3. The changing nature of employment for women who worked outside the home.

4. Factors leading to the discontent of farmers.

5. The impact of social changes on education and the impact of education on social mobility.

6. What was new about the "new" immigrants.

7. The origins of nativism and the movement for immigration restriction.

8. The problems associated with the growth of large urban centers.

9. How technological changes improved urban life.

10. The growth of popular amusements such as vaudeville and spectator sports.

12. The settlement house movement.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Compare the roles of men and women in middle-class and working-class families.

2. Consider the impact of the working-class attitudes described in the text on the potential for organizing workers.

3. Why did native-born Americans and older immigrants consider the new immigrants so hard to assimilate? Were they correct in their beliefs?

4. What might have compelled farmers, and particularly the children of farmers, to move to the cities?

4. How did the development of large urban centers contribute to outbreaks of cholera? What could cities do to prevent outbreaks of the disease?

5. Discuss the difference between Handlin’s characterization of immigrants as “uprooted” and Bodnar’s term “transplanted” (see the “Debating the Past” section). Which more closely describes the experience of immigrants to America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The text quotes Jacob Riis to illustrate the horror of New York's Lower East Side. Riis's book, *How the Other Half Lives* (1890), and his photographs of life on the Lower East Side are often used as a source of information on the tenements. In fact, they reveal even more about Riis himself than about the social conditions he described.

In 1870, at the age of 21, Jacob August Riis immigrated to the United States from Denmark. His father was a teacher in a Latin school, and Jacob helped him prepare copy for a weekly paper. Jacob also spent four years in Copenhagen as an apprentice to a carpenter. From there, he immigrated to the United States. At first, he had a difficult time. In 1877, however, he became a police reporter for the New York *Tribune* and the Associated Press. Police headquarters was located in the heart of the slums, and Riis became well acquainted with the neighborhood.

Indignant over the conditions he witnessed, Riis began to write stories about life in the slums for the *Tribune*. His stories helped prompt the appointment of the Tenement House Commission in 1884. At the end of the 1880s, Riis left the *Tribune* for the *Evening Sun* and compiled his first and most famous book, *How the Other Half Lives*. Among the reformers inspired by Riis's book was Theodore Roosevelt.
Although an immigrant himself, Riis in many ways typified upper-class reformers of the late nineteenth century. The nature of the solutions he proposed was technical; he displayed little interest in underlying economic problems. Riis also placed ultimate responsibility for their situation on the residents themselves, whom he described as "a class of tenantry living from hand to mouth, loose in morals, improvident in habits, degraded, and squalid as beggary itself." In some ways, the reforms Riis proposed were supercilious. Replacing slums with nice middle-class housing did not answer the problem; it merely displaced residents of the slums, because they would not be able to afford to live in the new housing. Moreover, however nice it was to replace broken-down tenements with a park, the residents of those tenements were left homeless.

Riis's attitudes can be traced to his own experience. He came from northern Europe and arrived before the massive waves of immigration of the 1880s. His native language was closer to English than, say, Slavic-based languages. He came to this country with some education and a craft. He had lived in a major city. He was not the object of bigotry and hatred as were Jews, Catholics, Italians, Poles, and so on. Riis seemed to think that he had been successful, and that failure to get ahead reflected poorly on immigrants who did not. He never stopped to think how different the new immigrants' situation was from his own.

Riis's basic solution for all problems the immigrants faced was assimilation, and, like many native-born Americans, he worried about the loss of an American community and that these new immigrants could not be assimilated. "The one thing you shall vainly ask for in the chief city of America," he wrote, "is a distinctively American community."

Riis made free generalizations about various ethnic groups and, like many of his day, confused "race" with ethnicity. Riis made favorable reference to "thrifty Germans." However, he had far fewer kind things to say about "swarthy" Italians, whom he considered to be inveterate gamblers who did not have sense enough to learn English. Although he deplored their tendency to reproduce "conditions of destitution and disorder which, set in the framework of Mediterranean exuberance, are the delight of the artist, but in a matter-of-fact American community become its danger and reproach," he judged Italians to be "gay, lighthearted...[and] inoffensive as a child."

Riis had still harsher observations about the Chinese. He regarded them as "born gamblers" who would not submit to the rule of law. Above all, they were heathens.

At the risk of distressing some well-meaning, but, I fear, too trustful people, I state it in advance as my opinion...that all attempts to make an effective Christian of John Chinaman will remain abortive in this generation; of the next I have, if anything, less hope. Ages of senseless idolatry, a mere grub-worship, have left him without the essential qualities for appreciating the gentle teachings of a faith whose motive and unselfish spirit are alike beyond his grasp.

Along with the Chinese, Riis displayed the greatest distaste for Jews, whom he characterized as greedy ("thrift is the watchword of Jewtown"), litigious, and (like the Chinese) heathen. He criticized Jews for working on Sunday; it apparently never occurred to him that Jews celebrate the Sabbath on Saturday.
Although less hostile, Riis's opinion of blacks was no more favorable. He found them to be "clean," happy-go-lucky, "cheerful," and religious, but he believed that their "love of ease" led them to take and remain happy in low-level jobs. Moreover, he deplored their "sensual" nature and their superstitiousness.

Thus, whatever his good intentions, Riis was bound by his culture. Even more, he demonstrated some of the most vicious tendencies of racial thought of his day. His solutions were designed to improve American society, rather than directly to aid the immigrants themselves. In this light, it is not surprising that immigrants often chose to vote against reformers such as Riis and for their own political bosses, who at least provided valued social services.

Introduction

One fascinating source of information about life in New York's Lower East Side is the advice column from the Jewish Daily Forward, a Yiddish-language newspaper serving New York's community of Jewish immigrants. In 1906, the Forward's editor, Abraham Cahan, began a column called "A Bintel Brief" (bundle of letters). Cahan wrote not only the responses; he wrote some of the letters as well. The bulk of letters in the early years of the column came from young, newly arrived immigrants. Some dealt with personal problems: love, jealousy, intermarriage, affairs between boarders and the married women in whose homes they lived. Others were about poverty, unemployment, and sweatshops. All provide a glimpse of the process of adjustment to life in America.


Questions for Discussion

1. What specific problems of adjustment to America are represented in these letters? What other problems of this sort can you envision?

2. In what ways might the experiences, conflicts, and accommodations of Jewish immigrants be similar to other groups, such as southern Italians, Poles, Slovaks, Slovenes, and Greeks? In what ways might they be different? What role might culture play in these differences?

3. What does the letter from "A Worried Reader" reveal about the process of assimilation?
Letters to the Jewish Daily Forward (1906-1907)

Dear Editor,

I am a Russian revolutionist and a freethinker. Here in America I became acquainted with a girl who is also a freethinker. We decided to marry, but the problem is that she has Orthodox parents, and for their sake we must have a religious ceremony. If we refuse the ceremony we will be cut off from them forever. Her parents also want me to go to the synagogue with them before the wedding, and I don't know what to do. Therefore I ask you to advise me how to act.

Respectfully, J.B.

ANSWER:
The advice is that there are times when it pays to give in to old parents and not grieve them. It depends on the circumstances. When one can get along with kindness it is better not to break off relations with the parents.

******

Worthy Editor,

Allow me a little space in your newspaper and, I beg you, give me some advice as to what to do.

There are seven people in our family—parents and five children. I am the oldest child, and a fourteen-year-old girl. We have been in the country two years and my father, who is a frail man, is the only one working to support the whole family.

I go to school, where I do very well. But since times are hard now and my father earned only five dollars this week, I began to talk about giving up my studies and going to work in order to help my father as much as possible. But my mother didn't even want to hear of it. She wants me to continue my education. She even went out and spent ten dollars on winter clothes for me. But I didn't enjoy the clothes, because I think I am doing the wrong thing. Instead of bringing something into the house, my parents have to spend money on me.

I have a lot of compassion for my parents. My mother is now pregnant, but she still has to take care of the three boarders we have in the house. Mother and Father work very hard and they want to keep me in school.

I am writing to you without their knowledge, and I beg you to tell me how to act. Hoping you can advise me, I remain,

Your reader,
S.
ANSWER:
The advice to the girl is that she should obey her parents and further her education, because in that way she will be able to give them greater satisfaction than if she went out to work.

********

Worthy Editor,

I was born in America and my parents gave me a good education. I studied Yiddish and Hebrew, finished high school, completed a course in bookkeeping and got a good job. I have many friends, and several boys have already proposed to me. Recently I went to visit my parents' home town in Russian Poland. My mother's family in Europe had invited my parents to a wedding, but instead of going themselves, they sent me. I stayed at my grandmother's with an aunt and uncle and we had a good time. Our European family, like my parents, are quite well off and they treated me well. They indulged me in everything and I stayed with them six months.

It was lively in the town. There were many organizations and clubs and they all accepted me warmly, looked up to me—after all, I was a citizen of the free land, America. Among the social leaders of the community was an intelligent young man, a friend of my uncle's, who took me to various gatherings and affairs.

He was very attentive, and after a short while he declared his love for me in a long letter. I had noticed that he was not indifferent to me, and I liked him as well. I looked up to him and respected him, as did all the townsfolk. My family became aware of it, and when they spoke to me about him, I could see they thought it was a good match.

He was handsome, clever, educated, a good talker and charmed me, but I didn't give him a definite answer. As my love for him grew, however, I wrote to my parents about him, and then we became officially engaged.

A few months later we both went to my parents in the States and they received him like their own son. My bridegroom immediately began to learn English and tried to adjust to the new life. Yet when I introduced him to my friends they looked at him with disappointment. "This 'greenhorn' is your fiancé?" they asked. I told them what a big role he played in his town, how everyone respected him, but they looked at me as if I were crazy and scoffed at my words.

At first I thought, Let them laugh, when they get better acquainted with him they'll talk differently. In time, though, I was affected by their talk and began to think, like them, that he really was a "greenhorn" and acted like one.
In short, my love for him is cooling off gradually. I'm suffering terribly because my feelings for him are changing. In Europe, where everyone admired him and all the girls envied me, he looked different. But, here, I see before me another person.

I haven't the courage to tell him, and I can't even talk about it to my parents. He still loves me with all his heart, and I don't know what to do. I choke it all up inside myself, and I beg you to help me with advice in my desperate situation.

Respectfully,
A Worried Reader

ANSWER:
The writer would make a grave mistake if she were to separate from her bridegroom now. She must not lose her common sense and be influenced by the foolish opinions of her friends who divided the world into "greenhorns" and real Americans.

We can assure the writer that her bridegroom will learn English quickly. He will know American history and literature as well as her friends do, and be a better American than they. She should be proud of his love and laugh at those who call him "greenhorn."
CHAPTER 20

Intellectual and Cultural Trends

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The Knowledge Revolution. Industrialization altered the way Americans thought as well as the way they made a living. The new industrial society placed new demands on education and gave rise to new ways of thinking about education. Darwin's theory of evolution influenced almost every field of knowledge. America emerged from the intellectual shadow of Europe, as Americans began to make significant contributions to the sciences as well as the relatively new social sciences, and American literature flourished. Americans of all ages began to hunger for information. Chautauqua-type movements, the growth of public libraries, and the boom in the number, size, and sophistication of newspapers began to satisfy the public's newfound curiosity. A growing and better-educated population created a demand for printed matter. This, combined with the integration of the economy, increased the importance of advertising. Papers such as Pulitzer's New York World and Hearst's New York Journal competed fiercely for readers.

Magazine Journalism. By the turn of the century, more than five thousand magazines were in publication. Prior to the 1880s, a few staid publications, such as Harper's and The Atlantic Monthly, dominated the field of serious magazines. In the 1860s and 1870s, Frank Leslie's magazines appealed to a broader audience. After the mid-1880s, several new, serious magazines adopted a hard-hitting, controversial, and investigative style and inquired into the social issues of their day. In 1889, Edward Bok became editor of Ladies' Home Journal. He offered articles on child care and household affairs, as well as literary items. In addition to printing colored reproductions of art masterpieces, Bok undertook crusades for women's suffrage, conservation, and other reforms. Bok not only catered to public tastes, he created new ones.

Colleges and Universities. The number of colleges increased as state universities and coeducational land-grant colleges sprang up across the nation. Still, less than 2 percent of the college age population attended college. Harvard led the way in reforming the curriculum and professionalizing college teaching. Established in 1876 and modeled on German universities, Johns Hopkins University pioneered the modern research university and professional graduate education in America. Beginning with Vassar College, the second half of the nineteenth century witnessed the establishment of numerous women's colleges. Alumni influence on campus grew, fraternities spread, and organized sports became a part of the college scene; colleges and universities mirrored the complexities of modern American society.
**Revolution in the Social Sciences.** Social scientists applied the theory of evolution to every aspect of human relations. They also attempted to use scientific methodology in their quest for objective truths in subjective fields. Controversies over trusts, slum conditions, and other problems drew scholars into practical affairs. Classical economics faced a challenge from the institutionalist school. Similar forces were at work in the disciplines of sociology and political science.

**Progressive Education.** Educators began to realize that traditional education did not prepare their students for life in industrial America. Settlement house workers found that slum children needed training in handicrafts, citizenship, and personal hygiene as much as in reading and writing. New theorists argued that good teaching called for professional training, psychological insights, enthusiasm, and imagination, not rote memorization and corporal punishment. John Dewey of the University of Chicago emerged as the leading proponent of progressive education. Dewey held that the school should serve as "an embryonic community," a mirror of the larger society. He contended that education should center on the child and that new information should relate to the child's existing knowledge. Dewey saw schools as instruments of reform. Toward that end, he argued that education should teach values and citizenship.

**Law and History.** Social evolutionists affected even the law. In 1881, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., in *The Common Law*, best summarized this new view, averring that "the felt necessities of time" and not mere precedent should determine the rules by which people are governed. Also responding to new intellectual trends, historians traced documentary evidence to discover the evolutionary development of their contemporary political institutions. One product of this new approach was the theory of the Teutonic origins of democracy, which has since been thoroughly discredited. However, the same general approach also produced Frederick Jackson Turner's "Frontier Thesis." If the claims of the new historians to objectivity were absurdly overstated, their emphasis upon objectivity, exactitude, and scholarly standards benefited the profession.

**Realism in Literature.** The majority of America's pre-Gilded Age literature was romantic in mood. However, industrialism, theories of evolution, the new pragmatism in the sciences, and the very complexities of modern life produced a change in American literature. Novelists began to examine social problems such as slums, political corruption, and the struggle between labor and capital.

**Mark Twain.** While no man pursued modern materialism with more vigor than Samuel L. Clemens, perhaps no man could illustrate the foibles and follies of America's Gilded Age with greater exactitude than his alter ego, Mark Twain. His keen wit, his purely American sense of humor, and his eye for detail allowed Twain to portray the best and the worst of his age. His works provide a brilliant and biting insight into the society of his day.

**William Dean Howells.** Initially for Howells, realism meant a realistic portrayal of individual personalities and the genteel, middle-class world that he knew best. He became, however, more and more interested in the darker side of industrialism. He combined his
concerns for literary realism and social justice in novels such as *The Rise of Silas Lapham* and *A Hazard of New Fortunes*. Following his passionate defense of the Haymarket radicals in 1886, he began calling himself a socialist. The most influential critic of his time, Howells was instrumental in introducing such authors as Tolstoy, Dostoyevski, Ibsen, and Zola to American readers. He also sponsored young American novelists such as Hamlin Garlin, Stephen Crane, and Frank Norris. Some of these young authors went beyond realism to naturalism, a philosophy that regarded humans as animals whose fate was determined by the environment.

**Henry James.** A cosmopolitan born to wealth, Henry James lived most of his adult life as an expatriate. James never gained the recognition of his countrymen during his lifetime. His major themes concerned the clash between American and European cultures and the corrupt relationships found in high society.

**Realism in Art.** Realism had a profound impact on American painting as well as writing. Foremost among realist artists was Thomas Eakins, who was greatly influenced by the seventeenth-century European realists. As an early innovator in motion pictures, Eakins used the medium to study people and animals in motion. Winslow Homer, a watercolorist from Boston, used all of the realist's techniques for accuracy and detail to enhance his sometimes romantic land- and seascapes. If the careers of Eakins and Homer demonstrated that America was not uncongenial to first-rate artists, two of the leading artists of the era, James McNeill Whistler and Mary Cassatt, were expatriates. During this period, vast collections of American and foreign artworks came to rest in the mansions and museums of the United States.

**The Pragmatic Approach.** It would indeed have been surprising if the intellectual ferment of this period had not affected traditional religious and philosophical values. Evolution posed an immediate challenge to traditional religious doctrine but did not seriously undermine most Americans' faith. If Darwin was correct, the biblical account of creation was false. However, many were able to reconcile evolutionary theory and religion. Darwinism had a less dramatic but more significant impact upon philosophical values. The logic of evolution made it difficult to justify fixed systems and eternal verities. Charles S. Pierce, the father of pragmatism, argued that concepts could be fairly understood only in terms of their practical effects. William James, the brother of the novelist and perhaps the most influential thinker of his time, presented pragmatism in more understandable language. He also contributed to the establishment of psychology as a scientific discipline. Although pragmatism inspired reform, it had its darker side. While relativism gave cause for optimism, it also denied the comfort of certainty and eternal values. Pragmatism also seemed to suggest that the end justified the means.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The factors leading to the expansion of knowledge and the dissemination of information.
2. The changes in the colleges and universities.
3. The expansion of educational opportunities for women and its social implications.
4. The rise of the new social sciences.
5. The reaction to Darwinist thought.
6. Theories of progressive education.
7. The impact of evolutionary thought on law and history.
8. Realism in American art and literature.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. The historian William Chafe has written that "sending a daughter to college [was] like letting the genie out of the bottle." Why was this so? What long-term effects did the higher education of a significant number of women have?
2. Explain how Darwinian theories could lead to advocacy of reform as well as advocacy of laissez-faire.
3. Like Darwinian evolution, pragmatism could inspire reform or corrosive cynicism. Discuss.
4. Given the population density of the West in the 1890s, Frederick Jackson Turner’s contention that the frontier was closed might seem a little ridiculous. Robert Wiebe, a highly original historian who published a number of important books from the 1960s through 1980s, significantly shaped the way modern historians understand the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Wiebe argued that, in the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century, America was not really a national society. Rather, it was a series of “island communities,” each of which provided a protected arena in which local cultures, values, and businesses thrived. In the last third of the nineteenth century, revolutions in communications, transportation, and business structures broke down the
isolation of these communities and began to form a national society and culture. What light does Wiebe’s thesis shed on Turner’s sense that the frontier was vanishing?

5. The "Re-Viewing the Past" section uses James Cameron's movie, *Titanic*, to analyze courtship patterns of New York's social elite in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Edith Wharton's novel, *The Age of Innocence*, provides a detailed examination of those elaborate rituals of courtship and marriage (as does the recent film version of the novel). After either reading the novel or viewing the film, discuss how *The Age of Innocence* reflects the rituals described in the textbook. To what extent do May Welland and Newland Archer accept the rules of society? How do the members of "society" subtly move to separate Newland Archer and Ellen Olenska without ever acknowledging that they are aware of the relationship Newland and Ellen?

**LECTURE SUPPLEMENT**

As the text points out, Mark Twain was a leader in the movement of literary realism. Twain rebelled against the romantic tradition and insisted that fiction realistically portray life. He had enormous contempt for the romanticism of Sir Walter Scott and bemoaned the English writer's popularity in, and influence on, the South. Twain went so far as to suggest that "something of a plausible argument might, perhaps, be made in support of the wild proposition" that Scott was "in great measure responsible for the [Civil] War."

If anything, Twain held the American romantic writer James Fenimore Cooper in even greater contempt. In two devastating essays, Twain vented his spleen against not only Cooper but the literary tradition he represented. The two essays, "Fenimore Cooper's Literary Offenses" and "Cooper's Prose Style," can be read as manifestos of literary realism. In the first, Twain suggested that "there are nineteen rules governing literary art in the domain of romantic fiction—some say twenty-two. In *Deerslayer* Cooper violated eighteen of them." Twain's "rules" stipulated that "a tale shall accomplish something and arrive somewhere," that "the episodes of a tale shall be necessary parts of the tale, and shall help develop it," and that "personages in a tale shall be alive, except in the case of corpses, and that always the reader shall be able to tell the corpses from the others."

Several of these specifically address the realist's critique of romantic fiction. Dialogue and dialect were areas near to the literary realist's art and heart. Twain's fifth rule required "that when the personages of a tale deal in conversation, the talk shall sound like human talk, and be talk such as human beings would be likely to talk in the given circumstances." The sixth required that "when the author describes the character of a personage in his tale, the conduct and conversation of that personage shall justify said description." The seventh rule elaborated somewhat on the sixth: "when a personage talks like an illustrated gilt-edged, tree-calf, hand-tooled, seven-dollar Friendship's Offering in the beginning of a paragraph, he shall not talk like a negro minstrel in the end of it."

Cooper's fantastic notions of woodsmanship probably offended the westerner in Twain as well as his literary sensibilities. Rule number eight demanded that "crass stupidities shall not be played upon the reader as 'the craft of the woodsman.'" Along the same lines, the ninth rule required that "the personages of a tale shall confine themselves to possibilities
and let miracles alone; or, if they venture a miracle, the author must so plausibly set it forth as to make it look possible and reasonable." Later in the essay, Twain made the point more bluntly: "If Cooper had any real knowledge of Nature's ways of doing things, he had a most delicate art in concealing the fact."

Twain's own works destroyed the romantic notions of war fostered by Scott. In "The Private History of a Campaign That Failed," Twain told a fictionalized version of his own military service in the Civil War. In that story, a group of young men in Missouri got up a military company and called themselves the "Marion Rangers." The young fellow who came up with the name was "young, ignorant, good natured,...full of romance, and given to reading chivalric novels."

The boys set out for New London, a hamlet ten miles away. "The first hour," recalled Twain, "was all fun, all idle nonsense and laughter. But that could not be kept up." When they approached a farmhouse where reports had indicated the presence of some Union soldiers, "we realized, with a cold suddenness, that here was no jest—we were standing face to face with actual war. We were equal to the occasion. In our response there was no hesitation, no indecision: we said that if Lyman wanted to meddle with those soldiers, he could go ahead and do it; but if he waited for us to follow him, he would wait a long time."

The company set up camp and encountered problems one never encountered in a Scott novel. For example, "nobody would cook; it was considered a degradation; so we had no dinner."

Still, the young men enjoyed the experience until they learned of rumors that the enemy was advancing in their direction. Since the information was only a rumor, however, they "did not know which way to retreat." They moved around the county for a few days, buffeted by rumors of an advancing enemy.

Later in the story, Twain's gentle undercutting of the romance and glory of war gave way to a more serious indictment. One night, after learning of another rumored sighting of the enemy nearby, the Marion Rangers heard hoofbeats. Then they saw a form of a man on horseback. The narrator grabbed a gun; someone in the panicked group said "fire," and the narrator pulled the trigger. The rider fell from the saddle. "My first feeling was of surprised gratification," wrote Twain. When the company rushed out to the fallen man, however, "the moon revealed him distinctly. He was lying on his back with his arms abroad; his mouth was open and his chest heaving with long gasps, and his white shirt-front was all splashed with blood. The thought shot through me that I was a murderer; that I had killed a man—a man who had never done me any harm."

For Twain, war was no chivalric picnic; it was not glorious charges and waving banners; it was murder. He expressed the same sentiments when the United States clamored for war against Spain in 1898. His story, "The War-Prayer," made clear precisely what people prayed for when they prayed for victory in war. "The War-Prayer" described a Sunday service as a people prepared for war. A patriotic minister evoked God's help and urged young men to seek honor and glory by crushing the foe. Then a mysterious, "aged stranger" entered the church and moved to the pulpit. The stranger announced that he came "from the Throne—bearing a message from Almighty God." He then told the congregation that God would answer their prayer "if such shall be your desire after I, His messenger, shall have explained to you its import—that is to say, its full import." The stranger then explained that for which the congregation had really prayed.
O Lord, our God, help us to tear their soldiers to bloody shreds with our shells; help us to cover their smiling fields with the pale forms of their patriot dead; help us to drown the thunder of their guns with the shrieks of their wounded, writhing in pain; help us to lay waste their humble homes with a hurricane of fire; help us to wring the hearts of their unoffending widows with unavailing grief; help us to turn them out roofless with their little children to wander unfriended the wastes of their desolated land in rags and hunger and thirst, sport of the sun-flames of summer and the icy winds of winter, broken in spirit, worn with travail, imploring Thee for the refuge of the grave and denied it...

Twain's attacks on the romantic fiction of Cooper's frontier novels clearly articulated the realist credo. "The Private History of a Campaign that Failed" and "The War-Prayer" provided the realist answer to Ivanhoe.

M. Carey Thomas (1857-1935) was the first dean and second president of Bryn Mawr College. She strongly believed that women should receive the same college education as men "because men and women are to live and work together as comrades and dear friends and lovers." Oberlin College became the first full-fledged college to admit women in 1837, and, by the time Bryn Mawr opened in 1885, Vassar, Smith, Wellesley, and the Rutgers Female Seminary offered the B.A. to women. Before 1885, however, none of the women's schools offered an education comparable to that available at the best of the men's colleges. Bryn Mawr took on that challenge. In addition to providing a quality undergraduate education, Bryn Mawr also offered graduate education, including a Ph.D. Thomas urged young women to become scholars and college professors.

Born into a Quaker family in 1857, Martha Carey Thomas enjoyed a comfortable childhood. Her father was a prominent physician in Baltimore. She graduated from Cornell University (where she was a member of the first class to accept women) and spent a year at Johns Hopkins, where she could attend certain lectures and work with professors willing to have her as a student. She could not, however, attend classes. Thomas found these conditions too limiting and humiliating to continue. After leaving Johns Hopkins, she went to Europe to study and received her Ph.D. at Zurich in 1882.

Thomas believed in the superiority of northern European "races" and was active in the eugenics movement. She boasted in 1916 that Bryn Mawr's student body was "overwhelmingly English, Scotch, Irish, Welsh[,] and other admixtures of French, German, Dutch largely predominant. All other strains are negligible."

A strong personality, Thomas could be abrasive. Many, including members of her faculty, found her high-handed and even ruthless. A future president of the United States and another forceful personality, Woodrow Wilson, taught at Bryn Mawr when Thomas was dean. Predictably, the two did not get along.

The first document is Thomas's letter of resignation from Hopkins. The second is her letter of application to Bryn Mawr.

For more information on Thomas, see Marjorie Housepian Dobkin, ed., The Making of a Feminist (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1979) and Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz, The Power and Passion of M. Carey Thomas (New York: Knopf, 1994).
Questions for Discussion

1. Given what the text says about the founding of Johns Hopkins, what the introduction to this set of documents says about Thomas's education, and what Thomas herself wrote in the second of the two documents, what conclusions can you draw about the impact of German higher education on the United States? Why is it not surprising that Thomas drew on Hopkins as a model?

2. Compare Thomas's conditions at Hopkins with segregation faced by black students in the South.

3. Why does Thomas think it better for a woman to be president of a women's college?
Gentlemen,

A year ago by your kindness I was admitted into the Johns Hopkins University as a candidate for a second degree. I naturally supposed that this would permit me to share in the unusual opportunities afforded to post graduate students under the able instruction of Professor Gildersleeve.

But the condition "without class attendance" has been understood to exclude my attendance upon the Greek Seminarium and the advanced instruction which is given to the other students of the University. I have thus found myself dependent upon such assistance as Professor Gildersleeve could give at the expense of his own time, which, notwithstanding his great personal kindness, I hesitated to encroach upon.

My object in entering the University was not so much to obtain a degree as to profit by the inestimable assistance Professor Gildersleeve gives to his pupils.

A trial of a year during which I received no help other than advice in reference to my course of reading and the privilege of passing an examination, has convinced me that under the present regulations, the assistance referred to cannot be obtained.

I make this explanation to you in order that my withdrawal may not be prejudicial to any other applicant, and because, so far as I have been informed, the only official recognition of my relation to the University exists upon your Minutes.

Respectfully,

M. C. Thomas
Carey Thomas to Dr. J. B. Rhoads (1883)

Confidential
Dr. J. B. Rhoads
Germantown
Philadelphia

My Dear Friend,

...My old desire to see an excellent woman's college in America has made the management of Bryn Mawr from the time of its first endowment a matter of great interest to me. This interest must be my excuse for writing to thee, as the newly appointed Vice-President of the Board of the Bryn Mawr Trustees and Chairman of the Executive and Building Committees, in regard to Bryn Mawr and in part in regard to myself.

It is now three years and a half since I came abroad, meaning only to pursue study for its own sake. My conviction of the value of a liberal education could not be made deeper, and my conception of what a college might become, clearer, by gradual training under German scholars who in a certain sense aid in making the science which they teach; and I began to doubt whether it would not be a more justifiable way of life, to aid in procuring this liberal education for other women, than merely to pursue my studies quietly at home....[After receiving the Doctor of Philosophy, *summa cum laude*] I felt that I might without presumptuousness, in case no one better fit should yet have been found, offer myself as a candidate for the presidency of Bryn Mawr.

I can do this with the less hesitation because I am personally convinced that it is best for the president of a woman's college to be a woman...

A man placed at the head of a woman's college feels all the circumstances by which it differs from a man's college as limitations only; a woman sees differently the especial needs, aims, interests, opportunities and possibilities....

...I am anxious that Bryn Mawr should open with a full number of competent professors and with as high a standard as it may intend to reach or maintain—that it should not, for instance, imitate Vassar, which began with a preparatory course that was to have been dropped afterwards, but has most unfortunately been retained....

...the best undergraduate training can never be given by a college which is not also able to guide advanced students. I should wish Bryn Mawr...[to be] a place where elementary college work is better done than elsewhere, and at the same time a place where women may at last be able to pursue advanced studies among women.

I should thus wish Bryn Mawr, taking girls at the beginning of their college course, to give them a systematic training under professors qualified to prepare both their own graduates and those from other colleges, so that these girls may either take their place afterwards as original scholars, or carry back with them into their own homes a love and understanding of study and culture; and this could not, I think, be better served than by establishing in imitation of the Johns Hopkins University, at least ten fellowships...
CHAPTER 21

Politics: Local, State and National

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Political Strategy and Tactics. Major parties normally avoid taking stands on controversial issues, but that tendency reached abnormal proportions in the late nineteenth century. A delicate balance of power between the parties as well as new and difficult issues, to which no answers were readily available, contributed to the parties' reluctance to adopt firm positions.

Voting Along Ethnic and Religious Lines. Although major parties had national committees and held national conventions to nominate presidential candidates and draft "platforms," these parties remained essentially separate state organizations. More often than not, a voter's ethnic origins, religious ties, perception of the Civil War, and whether he lived in a rural or urban setting influenced his decision to vote Republican or Democrat. Local and state issues often interacted with religious and ethnic issues and shaped political attitudes. The nation's political leadership, therefore, based their strategies and chose their candidates with an eye to local and personal factors as well as national concerns.

City Bosses. The stresses of rapid urban growth, the strain on infrastructures, and the exodus of the upper and middle classes all led to a crisis in city government. This turmoil gave rise to urban political bosses. These bosses provided social services in exchange for political support. Money for these services (and to enrich themselves) came from kickbacks and bribes. Despite their welfare work and popularity, most bosses were essentially thieves. The system survived because most comfortable urban dwellers cared little, if at all, for the fate of the poor. Many reformers resented the boss system mainly because it gave political power to people who were not "gentlemen."

Party Politics: Sidestepping the Issue. On the national scene, the South was solidly Democratic; New England and the trans-Mississippi West were staunchly Republican. New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois usually determined the outcome of elections. Only three presidential candidates between 1868 and 1900 did not come from New York, Indiana, Illinois, or Ohio; and all three lost. Partisan politics was intense in these "swing states." Because so much depended on these states, the level of political ethics was abysmally low.

Lackluster Leaders. America's presidents of the day demonstrated little interest in dealing with the urgent issues confronting the nation. Rutherford B. Hayes, president from 1877 to 1881, entered office with a distinguished personal and political record. Hayes favored sound money, civil service reform, and better treatment for blacks in the South. However, he made little progress in any of these areas.
The Republican party split in 1880 between the "Stalwarts" and the "Half-Breeds," and James A. Garfield emerged as a compromise candidate. Garfield was assassinated after only four months in office, but he had already demonstrated his ineffectiveness.

His successor, Chester A. Arthur, although personally honest and competent, had been an unblushing defender of the spoils system. As president, however, Arthur conducted himself with dignity, handled patronage matters with restraint, and gave nominal support to civil service reform. Arthur also favored regulation of the railroads and tariff reductions. Nevertheless, he was a political failure; the Stalwarts would not forgive Arthur for his "desertion," and the reformers would not forget his past. His party denied him its nomination in 1884.

The election of 1884 revolved around personal issues and was characterized by mudslinging on both sides. Grover Cleveland, former Democratic governor of New York, defeated James G. Blaine by fewer than 25,000 votes. Cleveland's was an honest, if unimaginative, administration. His emphasis on the strict separation of powers prevented his placing effective pressure on the Congress, and thus he failed to confront the issues of the day.

In 1888, Benjamin Harrison, a Republican from Indiana, defeated Cleveland. Harrison's election elevated a "human iceberg" and fiscal conservative to the presidency. During Harrison's term, Congress raised the tariff to an all-time high, passed the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Silver Purchase Act, and enacted a "force" bill to protect the voting rights of southern blacks. Harrison, however, remained aloof from this process.

Cleveland reclaimed the presidency from Harrison in 1892. By the standards of the late nineteenth century, Cleveland's margin of victory was substantial.

Congress intermittently produced some capable leaders. Among them, James G. Blaine, a Republican from Maine, stood out, both for his successes and for his shortcomings. Congressman William McKinley of Ohio was personally attractive, honest, and a politician to the core. Another Ohioan, John Sherman, held national office from 1855 to 1898. Although a financial expert, he proved all too willing to compromise his personal beliefs for political gain. Thomas B. Reed, a Republican congressman from Maine, was a man of acerbic wit and ultraconservative views. As Speaker of the House, his autocratic methods won him the nickname "Czar."

*Crops and Complaints.* If the middle-class majority remained comfortable and complacent, the economic and social status of farmers declined throughout the late nineteenth century; and their discontent forced American politics to confront the problems of the era. Farmers did well after the Civil War and into the 1880s. In the 1890s, however, American farmers suffered from drought, poor harvests, restrictive tariff and fiscal policies, low commodity prices, and competition from abroad. A downward swing in the business cycle exacerbated their plight.

*The Populist Movement.* The agricultural depression triggered an outburst of political radicalism, the Alliance movement. The Farmers Alliance spread throughout the South and into the Midwest. The farm groups entered politics in the elections of 1890. In 1892, these farm groups combined with representatives of the Knights of Labor and various professional reformers to organize the People's, or Populist, party. The convention adopted a sweeping
platform calling for a graduated income tax; the nationalization of rail, telegraph, and telephone systems; the "subtreasury" plan, and the unlimited coinage of silver. The party also called for the adoption of the initiative and referendum, popular election of United States senators, an eight-hour workday, and immigration restrictions. In the presidential election, Cleveland defeated Harrison. The Populist candidate, James B. Weaver, attracted over a million votes, but results in congressional and state races were disappointing. Opponents of the Populists in the South played on racial fears, and the Populists failed to attract the support of urban workers.

**Showdown on Silver.** By the early 1890s, discussion of federal monetary policy revolved around the coinage of silver. Traditionally, the United States issued gold and silver coins. The established ratio of roughly 15:1 undervalued silver, so no one took silver to the Mint. When the silver mines of Nevada and Colorado flooded the market with the metal and depressed the price of silver, it became profitable to coin bullion; but miners found that the Coinage Act of 1873 had demonetized the metal. Silver miners and inflationists demanded a return to bimetallism. Conservatives resisted. The result was a series of compromises. The Bland-Allison Act (1878) authorized the purchase of $2 million to $4 million of silver a month at the market price. This had little inflationary impact because the government consistently bought the minimum. The Sherman Silver Purchase Act (1890) required the government to buy 4.5 million ounces of silver monthly. However, increasing supplies drove the price of silver still lower.

**The Depression of 1893.** The London banking house of Baring Brothers collapsed in 1893, precipitating a financial panic that led to a worldwide industrial depression. Cleveland believed that the controversy over silver caused the depression by shaking the confidence of the business community. He summoned a special session of Congress and forced a repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act. The southern and western wings of the Democratic party deserted over this issue. Cleveland's handling of Coxey's Army and the Pullman strike further eroded public confidence in him, and the public was outraged when it took a syndicate of bankers headed by J. P. Morgan to avert a run on the Treasury.

With the silver issue looming ever larger and the Populists demanding unlimited coinage of silver at 16:1, the major parties could no longer avoid the money question in 1896. The Republicans nominated McKinley and endorsed the gold standard. The Democrats nominated William Jennings Bryan and ran on a platform of free silver. Although concerned over the loss of their distinctive party identity, the Populists nominated Bryan as well. In an effort to preserve their party identity, they substituted Tom Watson for the Democratic vice-presidential nominee.

**The Election of 1896.** The election of 1896, fueled by emotional debates over the silver issue, split party ranks across the nation. Pro-silver Republicans swung behind Bryan, while pro-gold Democrats, called "gold bugs" or National Democrats, nominated their own candidate. The Republican aspirant, William McKinley, relied upon his experience, his reputation for honesty and good judgment, his party's wealth, and the skillful management of Mark Hanna. Moreover, the depression worked to the advantage of the party out of power. Bryan, a powerful orator, was handicapped by his youth, his relative inexperience, and the
defection of the gold Democrats. He nevertheless conducted a vigorous campaign, traveling over eighteen thousand miles and delivering over six hundred speeches. On election day, McKinley decisively defeated Bryan.

**The Meaning of the Election.** Far from representing a triumph for the status quo, the election marked the coming of age of modern America. Although some conservatives feared revolution, the election was not fought along class lines. Workers and capitalists supported McKinley, and the farm vote split. The battle over gold and silver had little real significance; new gold discoveries led to an expansion of the money supply. Bryan's vision of America, and that of the political Populists who supported him, was one steeped in the past. McKinley, for all his innate conservatism, was capable of looking ahead toward the new century.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The major political issues of the Gilded Age.
2. The ethnic roots of party allegiance in the late nineteenth century.
3. The operation of urban political machines.
4. The operation of political parties in the late nineteenth century.
5. The lack of strong presidential leadership during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.
6. The sources of agrarian discontent and the rise of the Populist Party.
7. The significance of the silver issue.
8. The depression of 1893.
9. The reasons for McKinley's decisive triumph in the election of 1896.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Discuss and analyze the failure of the major parties to deal with the most significant issues of the late nineteenth century.

2. If you were an immigrant, would you have voted for the machine candidates? What did the reformers offer in exchange?

3. After the Democrats nominated Bryan, the Populists decided to make him their nominee as well. Was this the best strategy for the party? What other choices did they have?

4. Clearly the urban bosses both provided needed social services and engaged in extensive graft (see the “Debating the Past” and “City Bosses” sections). Evaluate the urban bosses and their contributions. Further information on this issue can be found in the documents section of this chapter in the Instructor’s Manual.

5. Which factors seemed to produce support for Populist candidates?

6. Political scientists refer to the elections of 1894 and 1896 as realigning elections; they established the Republican party as the majority party for a generation. What was the geographic basis of the Republican majority (see the “Mapping the Past” section)? How does that geography relate to the issues on which the elections of 1894 and 1896 were fought?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

A number of historians have characterized Grover Cleveland as perhaps the most callous man to sit in the White House. Despite this reputation, Cleveland was, on a personal level, sympathetic, compassionate, and generous. Yet he remained insensitive to the misfortunes of groups of people and certain types of social injustice. This apparent contradiction resulted from his highly moralistic personality, which saw every issue as a moral battle between right and wrong, and his adherence to the principles of nineteenth-century liberal theory. Cleveland's rigid morality and his ideology account for much of what seemed callous in his public career. Robert Kelley has argued that the two key factors in Cleveland's ideological makeup were his Presbyterian upbringing and his adherence to a particular brand of nineteenth-century liberalism.

Cleveland was raised in the Burned Over district of New York—the center of the great religious revivals of the first half of the nineteenth century. His father, however, was a Princeton-trained minister who opposed evangelicalism and believed that its absence of dogma and emphasis on free will was heresy. Ethno-cultural historians have pointed to the link between evangelicalism and reform in the nineteenth century. This link found political expression in the Whig and later Republican parties. Little wonder, then, that the Cleveland, father and son, became Democrats. Their religion stressed moral law; the operative word in Cleveland's vocabulary was "duty." He approached public office, particularly the
presidency, with a sense of martyrdom as well as a conviction that he was right. His string of vetoes as mayor, governor, and president read like a decalogue of "thou shall nots."

Grounded in the political thought of the early nineteenth century, Cleveland and his political mentor, Samuel Tilden, represented one strain of democratic ideology found in the Jacksonian tradition. The unifying concept of their philosophy was a belief in laissez-faire capitalism, buttressed by an opposition to all "privilege."

The elimination of privilege would not guarantee equality; indeed, adherents of this philosophy expected a moderate inequality of wealth. So long, however, as everyone had an equal opportunity to succeed, Cleveland and others believed, inequalities of wealth would not be great. Indeed, the health of the state required that a substantial proportion of people be of middling wealth. This vision was similar to Jefferson's belief in the yeoman farmer. Privilege constituted the great threat to disrupt this order. By privilege Cleveland meant corruption, class legislation, and speculation.

Thus, Cleveland's concept of government was an essentially negative one. He believed that government's duty was to be honest and economical. This meant that he was not receptive to demands for government action to give social and economic protection to workers, farmers, or consumers. As governor of New York, he vetoed a popular Five-Cent Fare Bill, which would have set all streetcar fares at five cents. He also vetoed a maximum hours law for conductors and drivers of streetcars on the ground that the law violated their right to contract. Moreover, Cleveland regarded the act as "class legislation." He saw no difference between such legislation and the granting of special privileges to a specific industry. For the same reasons, as president, he opposed the tariff.

The new industrial order of the late nineteenth century undermined the basis for Cleveland's belief system, yet Cleveland remained a prisoner of his ideology. The Jacksonian liberalism he embraced was a product of an earlier social order. In addition to his creed, Cleveland was a prisoner of his own sense of duty and morality. In adhering to his beliefs, he was blind to the changing realities of the late nineteenth century, to the end of the social order that had given rise to his creed. He continued to believe that, given a chance, his Jacksonian liberalism would work. He was sure that if government eliminated privilege, individuals would rise and fall according to their abilities.

Cleveland could not see that the economic order that emerged with the rise of big business permanently ended the economic and social systems that had produced his belief system. As a result, Cleveland's ideology suffered a startling loss of relevancy. In this, Cleveland was not alone, but he alone was president when the first major industrial depression hit.
DOCUMENTS

Introduction

The text contends that "most bosses were essentially thieves. Efforts to romanticize them as Robin Hoods of industrial society grossly distort the facts." However, urban bosses provided needed social services in an era when government did virtually nothing along those lines. Indeed, there was nowhere else to go for many services. Granted that urban bosses enriched themselves and that graft and corruption were horribly expensive ways to provide basic social services, still, many would argue that the text is unduly harsh in its assessment of the urban bosses.

The first document is an excerpt from Lincoln Steffens, *The Shame of the Cities* (1904). Steffens was among the most famous of the muckraking journalists. He wrote a series of articles on municipal corruption for *McClures* magazine in 1902 and 1903. They were published as a book the following year. Steffens reflected the disgust reformers felt for the machines and their methods of politics.

The second document comes from William L. Riordon's *Plunkitt of Tammany Hall* (1905), a collection of conversations Riordon allegedly had with George Washington Plunkitt, a Tammany ward boss. Plunkitt's transportation and general contracting business thrived through his connections with Tammany bosses from Tweed through Murphy. Plunkitt distinguished between "honest graft," which he argued was the oil that kept the machine running, and "dishonest graft."

Questions for Discussion

1. Is Plunkitt right about Steffens? If so, to what extent and why?

2. Elsewhere in *The Shame of the Cities*, Steffens excoriates kickbacks and other forms of corruption. To be sure, much of the money went to leaders like Plunkitt. Too often, however, reformers ignored the fact that some of the money went to provide services. Why did reformers fail to wean voters from the machines?

3. Is Steffens's analogy between voters in Philadelphia and blacks in the South apt? If so, why? If not, why not?

4. Is Plunkett correct in his assertion that no one is harmed by "honest graft"?
Lincoln Steffens, *The Shame of the Cities* (1904)

The Philadelphia machine isn't the best. It isn't sound, and I doubt if it would stand in New York or Chicago. The enduring strength of the typical American political machine is that it is a natural growth—a sucker, but deep-rooted in the people. The New Yorkers vote for Tammany Hall. The Philadelphians do not vote; they are disfranchised, and their disfranchisement is one anchor of the foundation of the Philadelphia organization.

This is no figure of speech. The honest citizens of Philadelphia have no more rights at the polls than the negroes down South. Nor do they fight very hard for this basic privilege. You can arouse their Republican ire by talking about the black Republican votes lost in the Southern States by white Democratic intimidation, but if you remind the average Philadelphian that he is in the same position, he will look startled, then say, "That's so, that's literally true, only I never thought of it in just that way." And it is literally true.

The machine controls the whole process of voting, and practices fraud at every stage. The assessor's list is the voting list, and the assessor is the machine's man....The assessor pads the list with the names of dead dogs, children, and non-existent persons. One newspaper printed the picture of a dog, another that of a little four-year-old negro boy, down on such a list. A ring orator in a speech resenting sneers at his ward as "low down" reminded his hearers that that was the ward of Independence Hall, and naming over signers of the Declaration of Independence, he closed his highest flight of eloquence with the statement that "these men, the fathers of American liberty, voted down here once. And," he added, with a catching grin, "they vote here yet." Rudolph Blankenburg, a persistent fighter for the right and the use of the right to vote (and, by the way, an immigrant), sent out just before one election a registered letter to each voter on the rolls of a certain selected division. Sixty-three per cent were returned marked "not at," "removed," "deceased," etc. From one four-story house where forty-four voters were addressed, eighteen letters came back undelivered; from another of forty-eight voters, came back forty-one letters; from another sixty-one out of sixty-two; from another, forty-four out of forty-seven. Six houses in one division were assessed at one hundred and seventy-two voters, more than the votes cast in the previous election in any one of two hundred entire divisions.

The repeating is done boldly, for the machine controls the election officers, often choosing them from among the fraudulent names; and when no one appears to serve, assigning the heeler ready for the expected vacancy. The police are forbidden by law to stand within thirty feet of the polls, but they are at the box and they are there to see that the machine's orders are obeyed and that repeaters whom they help to furnish are permitted to vote without "intimidation" on the names they, the police, have supplied....
"Everybody is talkin' these days about Tammany men growin' rich on graft, but nobody thinks of drawin' the distinction between honest graft and dishonest graft. There's all the difference in the world between the two. Yes, many of our men have grown rich in politics. I have myself. I've made a big fortune out of the game, and I'm gettin' richer every day, but I've not gone in for dishonest graft—blackmailin' gamblers, saloon-keepers, disorderly people, etc.—and neither has any of the men who have made big fortunes in politics.

"There's an honest graft, and I'm an example of how it works. I might sum up the whole thing by sayin': 'I seen my opportunities and I took 'em.'

"Just let me explain by examples. My party's in power in the city, and it's goin' to undertake a lot of public improvements. Well, I'm tipped off, say, that they're going to layout a new park at a certain place.

"I see my opportunity and I take it. I go to that place and I buy up all the land I can in the neighborhood. Then the board of this or that makes its plan public, and there is a rush to get my land, which nobody cared particular for before.

"Ain't it perfectly honest to charge a good price and make a profit on my investment and foresight? Of course it is. Well, that's honest graft....

"...It's just like lookin' ahead in Wall Street or in the coffee or cotton market.

"...Now, let me tell you that most politicians who are accused of robbin' the city get rich the same way.

"They didn't steal a dollar from the city treasury. They just seen their opportunities and took them. That is why, when a reform administration comes in and spends a half million dollars in tryin' to find the public robberies they talked about in the campaign, they don't find them.

"The books are always all right. The money in the city treasury is all right. Everything is all right. All they can show is that the Tammany heads of departments looked after their friends, within the law, and gave them what opportunities they could to make honest graft....

"I've been readin' a book by Lincoln Steffens on *The Shame of the Cities*. Steffens means well but, like all reformers, he don't know how to make distinctions. He can't see no difference between honest graft and dishonest graft and, consequent, he gets things all mixed up. There's the biggest kind of a difference between political looters and politicians who make a fortune out of politics by keepin' their eyes wide open. The looter goes in for himself alone without considerin' his organization or his city. The politician looks after his own interests, the organization's interests, and the city's interests all at the same time...."
CHAPTER 22

The Age of Reform

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Roots of Progressivism. Progressives were never a single unified group seeking a single objective. They sought civil service reform, political reform, government regulation of big business, improvement of conditions in the workplace, and the enactment of antitrust legislation. Concerned with changes brought by industrialization and influenced by intellectual currents, many members of the middle class, including religious leaders, college professors, and lawyers embraced reform.

The Muckrakers. The popular press published articles on social, economic, and political issues of the day. McClure's published Ida Tarbell's critical series on Standard Oil and Lincoln Steffens's exposé on city machines. Soon, other editors rushed to adopt McClure's formula. A veritable army of journalists published stories exposing labor gangsterism, the adulteration of foods and drugs, corruption in college athletics, and prostitution. The degree of sensationalism used by some authors prompted Theodore Roosevelt to label them "muckrakers."

The Progressive Mind. Despite its democratic rhetoric, progressivism was paternalistic, moderate, and often softheaded. Reformers oversimplified issues and regarded their personal values as absolute standards. Progressives came from all walks of life and included great tycoons, small operators, advocates of social justice, prohibitionists, and others. Progressivism never truly challenged the fundamental principles of capitalism; nor did it seek to reorganize the basic structures of society. Many progressives held anti-immigrant views, and few progressives concerned themselves with the plight of blacks.

"Radical" Progressives: The Wave of the Future. Influenced by European revolutionary theories, some segments of American society sought radical relief for the ills of industrialism. Some labor leaders rejected craft unionism and advocated socialism. In 1905, a coalition of mining and other unions, socialists, and other radicals formed a new union, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). The openly anti-capitalist IWW never attracted the support of mainstream labor. Other nonpolitical European ideas influenced progressive intellectuals. Few understood, and even fewer read, Freud, but his theories became a popular topic of conversation. Some used Freud to argue against conventional standards of sexual morality.

Political Reform: Cities First. Corrupt political machines ruled many cities. City bosses and machine politics became the primary targets of progressivism. Reformers could not defeat the machines without changing urban political structures. New forms included "home rule," nonpartisan bureaus, city commissioners, and city managers. Beyond reforming the political process, progressives hoped to use it to improve society. Some experiments at the
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municipal level included urban renewal, municipalizing public utilities and public transportation systems, and reform of penal institutions.

**Political Reform: The States.** Corruption and mismanagement at the state level impeded the efforts of municipal reformers. Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin perhaps best illustrated progressivism in action at the state level. Among La Follette's reforms were the adoption of direct primaries, corrupt practices acts, and laws to limit campaign spending and funding of lobbyists. La Follette also advocated state regulation of the railroads and management of natural resources. Other states adopted many elements of the Wisconsin Idea. Some states went beyond Wisconsin in making their governments responsive to the popular will with the adoption of the initiative and referendum.

**State Social Legislation.** By the 1890s, many states passed laws regulating conditions in the workplace. These laws restricted child labor, set maximum hours for women and children, and regulated conditions in sweatshops. Conservative judges, unwilling to accept an expansion of the states' coercive power, often struck down such laws on the ground that they violated the "due process" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Progressives also achieved state legislation regulating the transportation, utilities, banking, and insurance industries. However, piecemeal regulation by the states failed to solve the problems of an increasingly complex society.

**Political Reform: The Women's Suffrage Movement.** The Progressive Era saw the culmination of the struggle for women's suffrage. The women's movement was handicapped by rivalry between the NWSA and the AWSA, by Victorian attitudes about the role of women, and by applications of Darwinian theory. Feminists attempted to turn ideas of women's moral superiority to their advantage in the struggle for voting rights. In doing so, however, they surrendered the principle of equality. In 1890, the two major women's groups combined to form the National American Women's Suffrage Association (NAWSA). The growth of progressivism contributed to the cause of suffrage. After winning the right to vote in several states, NAWSA focused its attention on the national level. The Nineteenth Amendment (1920) granted women the right to vote.

**Political Reform: Income Taxes and Popular Election of Senators.** Progressivism also found expression in the Sixteenth Amendment, which authorized a federal income tax, and the Seventeenth Amendment (1913), which provided for direct election of senators. A group of progressive members of Congress also managed to reform the House of Representatives by limiting the power of the Speaker.

**Theodore Roosevelt: Cowboy in the White House.** Roosevelt assumed the presidency following McKinley's assassination. He brought to the presidency solid political qualifications, a distinguished war record, and credentials as a historian. Although the prospect of Roosevelt in the White House alarmed conservatives, he moved slowly and with restraint. His domestic program included some measure of control of large corporations, more power for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the conservation of natural resources.
Roosevelt and Big Business. Although Roosevelt won a reputation as a "trustbuster," he did not believe in breaking up big corporations indiscriminately; he preferred to regulate them. Roosevelt was not an enemy to all large-scale enterprises, merely those that flagrantly seemed to restrain trade. Facing a Congress that would not pass strong regulatory laws, Roosevelt resorted to use of the Sherman Act. Although his Justice Department brought suit against the Northern Securities Company, the President preferred to reach "gentlemanly agreements" with large trusts. This approach proved successful with U.S. Steel and International Harvester. When Standard Oil reneged on an agreement, however, the Justice Department brought suit.

Roosevelt and the Coal Strike. Roosevelt effectively used the powers and prestige of his office to intervene in the anthracite coal strike of 1902. He attempted to arbitrate between management and the United Mine Workers, but management proved intransigent. The president's threat to seize and operate the mines convinced the owners of the wisdom of accepting arbitration. Neither side was entirely pleased, but, to the American public, the incident seemed to illustrate the progressive spirit and Roosevelt's "square deal." Roosevelt's use of executive power in this case dramatically extended presidential authority and hence that of the federal government.

T.R.'s Triumphs. Roosevelt easily defeated the Democratic candidate, Alton B. Parker, in 1904. Encouraged by his victory and aware of the growing militancy of progressives, the president pressed Congress for passage of the Hepburn Act (1906), which allowed the ICC to inspect the books of railroad companies and to fix maximum rates. It also gave the ICC authority over other interstate carriers and prohibited railroads from issuing passes freely. In response to Upton Sinclair's novel, The Jungle, which described the filthy conditions in the meat-packing industry, Roosevelt pressed Congress to pass the Pure Food and Drug Act (1907).

Roosevelt Tilts Left. As the progressive impulse advanced, Roosevelt advanced with it. Roosevelt's approach became increasingly liberal. He placed more than 150 million acres of public lands in federal reserves, strictly enforced usage laws on federal lands, and encouraged state governments actively to regulate their public lands. As Roosevelt moved toward the left, many Old Guard Republicans turned against the president. The Panic of 1907 exacerbated the split. When conservatives blamed him for the panic, Roosevelt responded by moving further toward progressive liberalism; he advocated federal income and inheritance taxes, stricter regulation of interstate corporations, and reforms designed to help industrial workers. When Roosevelt began to criticize the courts, he lost all chance of obtaining further reform legislation.

William Howard Taft: The Listless Progressive, or More Is Less. Roosevelt's hand-picked successor, William Howard Taft, garnered the support of Old Guard Republicans as well as progressives and easily defeated William Jennings Bryan. Although he enforced the Sherman Act vigorously and signed the Mann-Elkins Act, which expanded the power of the ICC, Taft made a less aggressive president than T.R. had been. Taft was not comfortable with Roosevelt's sweeping use of executive power. Political ineptness contributed to Taft's
problems. He alienated progressives when he failed to lend full support to a Congressional movement to reform the tariff system. Taft ran afoul of the growing conservation movement in 1910 when he fired the chief forester of the United States, Gifford Pinchot.

**Breakup of the Republican Party.** The Ballinger-Pinchot affair signaled the beginning of a split between Roosevelt and Taft. Perhaps inevitably, the Republican party split into factions. Roosevelt sided with the progressives, and Taft threw in his lot with the Old Guard. Taft's management of an antitrust action brought against U.S. Steel in 1911 finalized the split. A portion of the suit was directed against the merger of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company with U.S. Steel in 1907. Roosevelt had personally approved of the merger and viewed Taft's action as a personal attack. Roosevelt decided to challenge Taft for the nomination in 1912. While Roosevelt carried the bulk of the primaries, Taft controlled the party apparatus and secured the nomination. Roosevelt formed the breakaway Progressive party, also known as the "Bull Moose" party, and ran in the general election.

**The Election of 1912.** The Democrats ran Woodrow Wilson, the reform governor of New Jersey. Wilson's "New Freedom" promised the eradication of special interests and a return to competition. Roosevelt called for a "New Nationalism," based on regulation of large corporations. Hard-core Republicans voted for Taft, but the progressive wing went for Roosevelt. Democrats, both conservative and progressive, voted for Wilson. As a result, Wilson won a comfortable plurality of the popular vote and a large majority in the electoral college. Nevertheless, Wilson failed to win a majority of the popular vote.

**Wilson: The New Freedom.** Wilson quickly established his legislative agenda and successfully steered his legislation through Congress. In 1913, the Underwood Tariff substantially reduced tariffs; a graduated income tax made up for lost revenue. The Federal Reserve Act finally provided the nation with a centralized banking system. Congress created the Federal Trade Commission to regulate unfair trade practices. The Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914 outlawed price discrimination, "tying" agreements, and the creation of interlocking directorates. Wilson's decisive management style and a Democratic majority in Congress accounted in large part for his successes. Wilson's progressivism had its limits; he refused to support legislation to provide low-interest loans to farmers or to exempt unions from antitrust actions. Wilson also declined to push for a federal law prohibiting child labor and refused to back a constitutional amendment granting the vote to women.

**The Progressives and Minority Rights.** A darker side of progressivism manifested itself in the area of race relations. A reactionary on racial matters, Wilson was fairly typical of progressive attitudes; only a handful failed to exhibit prejudice against non-white people. Most progressives assumed that Native Americans were incapable of assimilating into white society. Asians were subject to intense discrimination. In the South, the Progressive Era witnessed the institutionalization of "Jim Crow." Many progressive women adopted racist arguments in support of the Nineteenth Amendment, while southern progressives argued for the disenfranchisement of blacks to "purify" the political system. Booker T. Washington and his philosophy of accommodation failed to stem the rising tide of racism, and a number of young and well-educated blacks broke away from his leadership.
Black Militancy. W.E.B. Du Bois, the first American black to earn a Ph.D. from Harvard, called upon blacks to reject Washington's accommodationism. He urged them to take pride in their racial and cultural heritage and demanded that blacks take their rightful place in society without waiting for whites to give it to them. He recognized that environment, not racial factors, caused the problems of poverty and crime. Du Bois was not, however, an admirer of the ordinary black American. Frankly elitist in approach, Du Bois contended that a "talented tenth" of blacks would lead the way to their race's success. In 1905, he and other like-minded blacks founded the Niagara Movement. While it failed to attract mass support, it did stir some white consciences. A group comprised largely of white liberals founded the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in 1909. The NAACP was dedicated to the eradication of racial discrimination from American society. The leadership of the NAACP was largely white in its early years, but Du Bois became a national officer and editor of the organization's journal. More important, after the founding of the NAACP, virtually every leader in the struggle for racial equality rejected Washington's approach.

POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The "search for order" in the Progressive Era.

2. The impact of muckraking journalists.

3. The differences between the moderate and "radical" progressives.


5. Why progressives began to look toward reforming state governments.


7. How the courts used the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to strike down social justice legislation.

8. Arguments used to support women's suffrage.

9. The Seventeenth and Nineteenth Amendments.

10. Teddy Roosevelt's position on large corporations.

11. The split in the Republican party.

13. The reforms of Wilson's first administration.

14. Progressive attitudes toward racial minorities.


POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Woodrow Wilson greatly admired the British system of government. He believed that the separation of the executive from the legislature greatly weakened the American president. In what ways did his presidency reflect this belief?

2. In what ways did progressives seek to maintain the status quo in American society?

3. What role did women play in progressivism? How did their concerns shape the Progressive Era?

4. The “Debating the Past” section cites the argument of Daniel Rogers that reformers in Europe and America “sought to counteract the increasing concentration of industrial power” but that “none met with great success.” Does the information in this chapter about specific legislative achievements of the Progressives support or contradict Rogers?

5. In what ways was Emma Goldman (see the “American Lives” section) a typical immigrant? In what ways was she not?
LECTURE SUPPLEMENTS

Hazen Pingree and Urban Reform

The text discusses the changes progressive city administrations made after defeating the urban machines. It is worth asking, however, how the reformers won the votes to defeat the bosses.

Progressivism represented a political response on the part of a great majority of the American people to the problems created by the enormous economic and social changes of the late nineteenth century. The most immediate problems were associated with the breakdown of responsible and effective government—especially at the local level. The new industrial order brought slums, crime, poverty, the exploitation of workers, and great economic concentration.

The key to galvanizing a response to these ills was the panic of 1893. What began as a business panic early in the year deepened into a depression by summer. By 1895, almost three million workers were unemployed—the first major industrial unemployment in American history. The response to the crisis of the 1890s began at the municipal level for several reasons. First, the national government did not respond; indeed, many believed that the federal government had no business interfering in the business cycle. Second, it was easier for a small group of reformers to influence a local election than a national one. Third, people were most affected by decisions made at the city level. Moreover, these decisions dealt with life and death. Unsafe drinking water could mean an outbreak of cholera. Inadequate disposal of garbage could also mean an outbreak of contagious disease. Unpaved streets made it difficult to get from place to place and even harder to move goods. In short, people could not survive without effective city governments.

Urban machines provided some of the services mentioned as well as some welfare functions, but they did so unequally and at great cost. The only way to defeat the machines was to offer something better in their place. Until the 1890s, reformers offered nothing in exchange for getting rid of bosses who provided necessary social services.

One of the early urban reformers to offer a viable alternative to the machines was Hazen Pingree of Detroit. A shoe manufacturer and a self-made millionaire, Pingree first won election as mayor in 1889. He won election as a Republican reformer and with largely middle-class and upper-middle-class support.

While he never lost his interest in clean, honest, and efficient government, his agenda changed after 1890. Issues of social reform came to dominate his attention. Pingree reduced utility and transportation rates, improved public services (and made sure they were distributed equitably), and favored municipal ownership of utilities. In the election of 1893, Pingree lost support among upper-class and native-born voters, but he more than made up for that with gains among working-class and foreign-born voters.

Originally elected to defeat an entrenched, corrupt machine, Pingree created a machine of his own, but his was a new creature, a reform machine. He won over immigrant, ethnic, and working-class voters by filling the functions of the machines and by doing it more cheaply. Rather than funding social services through graft, the city provided services from revenues. The elimination of graft enabled the city to provide the services far more cheaply. Polite reformers of the nineteenth century railed against corrupt bosses (and the ethnics who
supported them) but offered nothing in return. Pingree and other reformers defeated the bosses by absorbing and institutionalizing their functions.

Pingree's experience in Detroit was not unique. George H. ("Boss") Cox in Cincinnati, Mark Fagan and George Record in Jersey City, Samuel M. ("Golden Rule") Jones and Brand Whitlock in Toledo, and (perhaps most successful of all) Tom Johnson in Cleveland all established reform administrations on a basis similar to Pingree's in Detroit. Common themes were reduction of transportation and utility fees, provision of services, creation of public recreational facilities, control over police departments, and more efficient city governments. These new reform bosses pioneered the first political response to the problems associated with the social and economic changes of the generation before. In doing so, they paved the way for the Progressive Era.


Prostitution and Reform

The reform impulse manifested itself in many ways. Progressives worked to clean up corruption in city governments, to improve municipal services, to restrict child labor, to set maximum hours for women and children, and to limit noise in cities. In addition, they turned their attention to a variety of social ills, including slum housing, juvenile delinquency, and intemperance. Progressives believed that government, with the advice of experts, could manage society in a fashion to eliminate these social evils. Imbued with this mentality, reformers also turned their attention to another problem associated with immigration and the growth of cities, prostitution.

Prostitution became a major source of national concern during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Muckraking journalists, novelists, and filmmakers sensationalized the issue. Lurid tales of seduction, rape, and sexual slavery brought the issue to the forefront of the public imagination.

Prostitution became such a central concern for several reasons. Progressives had concrete reasons to be distressed; social and economic issues related to prostitution included: low wages paid to women, corruption of local governments, and the spread of venereal disease. In 1918, prostitution seemed to threaten the country's ability to wage a war to make the world safe for democracy. Beyond that, at a psychological and emotional level, prostitution symbolized a number of distressing developments: the emergence of single
working women in the cities, immigration, changing standards of sexual morality and behavior.

Opponents to prostitution differed in their agendas. For some, antiprostitution provided a means to eliminate corrupt ward bosses and officials who profited from the vice trade. Others saw the campaign against prostitution as a step towards a more comprehensive reform agenda. Some feminists regarded the elimination of prostitution as a necessary step towards the emancipation of women. Still other reformers saw antiprostitution as a means of addressing poverty, poor housing, low wages for women, and unemployment.

Opponents of prostitution produced an impressive body of research, statistics, and information about prostitution. However, as Mark Thomas Connelly has observed, they too often reduced the issue "to the most culturally palatable slogans." Progressive opposition to prostitution represented part of what Robert Wiebe has called the "search for order." As society adjusted to the profound changes wrought by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, prostitution lost its power as a symbol of a society out of kilter.


**DOCUMENTS**

*Introduction*

The election of 1912 presents a curious spectacle to modern observers. Two supremely intelligent and articulate candidates debated the major issues of the day, and not just at the level of specific policies. Wilson and Roosevelt debated a larger vision of how to deal with the most pressing problem of the new century—economic concentration. To a generation accustomed to George Bush standing in front of a flag at a flag factory and Michael Dukakis riding around in a tank, it seems incredible that a Ph. D. from Johns Hopkins, professor and president of Princeton, and author of several books on American government would debate a Harvard graduate, talented amateur historian, and naturalist for the presidency.

Roosevelt expounded on his vision of a "New Nationalism," which recognized the inevitability of economic concentration and called on government to regulate the new economic structures. Wilson's "New Freedom," which advocated breaking up large concentrations of wealth and a return to competition, was less well formulated at the outset and evolved during the campaign.

The first document is an excerpt from Roosevelt's speech at Osawatomie, Kansas, in 1910. In this address, he outlined what became the basis of his campaign in 1912.


**Questions for Discussion**

1. Why does Wilson mention George W. Perkins's involvement with the Progressive party? What does Wilson imply?

2. What is Roosevelt's answer to Wilson's charge that the New Nationalism would lead to the "time when the combined power of high finance would be greater than the power of the government"?

3. Which approach most accurately reflects the economic realities of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries? Which most accurately anticipates the future?
Practical equality of opportunity for all citizens, when we achieve it, will have two great results. First, every man will have a fair chance to make of himself all that in him lies; to reach the highest point to which his capacities, unassisted by special privilege of his own and unhampered by the special privilege of others, can carry him, and to get for himself and his family substantially what he has earned. Second, equality of opportunity means that the commonwealth will get from every citizen the highest service of which he is capable. No man who carries the burden of the special privileges of another can give to the commonwealth that service to which it is fairly entitled.

Now, this means that our government, national and state, must be freed from the sinister influence or control of special interests. Exactly as the special interests of cotton and slavery threatened our political integrity before the Civil War, so now the great special business interests too often control and corrupt the men and methods of government for their own profit. We must drive the special interests out of politics. That is one of our tasks today.

The true friend of property, the true conservative, is he who insists that property shall be the servant and not the master of the commonwealth; who insists that the creature of man's making shall be the servant and not the master of the man who made it. The citizens of the United States must effectively control the mighty commercial forces which they have themselves called into being.

It has become entirely clear that we must have government supervision of the capitalization, not only of the public service corporations, including, particularly, railways, but of all corporations doing an interstate business. I do not wish to see the nation forced into the ownership of the railways if it can possibly be avoided, and the only alternative is thoroughgoing and effective regulation, which shall be based on a full knowledge of all the facts, including a physical valuation of property.

Combinations in industry are the result of an imperative economic law which cannot be repealed by political legislation. The effort at prohibiting all combination has substantially failed. The way out lies, not in attempting to prevent such combinations, but in completely controlling them in the interest of the public welfare.
The doctrine that monopoly is inevitable and that the only course open to the people of the United States is to submit to and regulate it found a champion during the campaign of 1912 in the new party, or branch of the Republican Party, founded under the leadership of Mr. Roosevelt, with the conspicuous aid,-I mention him with no satirical intention, but merely to set the facts down accurately,-of Mr. George W. Perkins, organizer of the Steel Trust and the Harvester Trust, and with the support of more than three millions of citizens, many of them among the most patriotic, conscientious and high-minded men and women of the land. The fact that its acceptance of monopoly was a feature of the new party platform from which the attention of the generous and just was diverted by the charm of a social program of great attractiveness to all concerned for the amelioration of the lot of those who suffer wrong and privation, and the further fact that, even so, the platform was repudiated by the majority of the nation, render it no less necessary to reflect on the significance of the confession made for the first time by any party in the country's history. It may be useful, in order to the relief of the minds of many from an error of no small magnitude, to consider now, the heat of a presidential contest being past, exactly what it was that Mr. Roosevelt proposed.

Mr. Roosevelt attached to his platform some very splendid suggestions as to noble enterprises which we ought to undertake for the uplift of the human race.... If you have read the trust plank in that platform as often as I have read it, you have found it very long, but very tolerant. It did not anywhere condemn monopoly, except in words; its essential meaning was that the trusts have been bad and must be made to be good. You know that Mr. Roosevelt long ago classified trusts for us as good and bad, and he said that he was afraid only of the bad ones. Now he does not desire that there should be any more bad ones, but proposes that they should all be made good by discipline, directly applied by a commission of executive appointment. All he explicitly complains of is lack of publicity and lack of fairness; not the exercise of power, for throughout that plank the power of the great corporations is accepted as the inevitable consequence of the modern organization of industry. All that it is proposed to do is to take them under control and regulation....

The fundamental part of such a program is that the trusts shall be recognized as a permanent part of our economic order, and that the government shall try to make trusts the ministers, the instruments, through which the life of this country shall be justly and happily developed on its industrial side....

Shall we try to get the grip of monopoly away from our lives, or shall we not? Shall we withhold our hand and say monopoly is inevitable, that all we can do is to regulate it? Shall we say that all we can do is to put government in competition with monopoly and try its strength against it? Shall we admit that the creature of our own hands is stronger than we are? We have been dreading all along the time when the combined power of high finance would be greater than the power of the government.
CHAPTER 23

From Isolation to Empire

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Isolation or Imperialism? In the decades after the Civil War, Americans were primarily occupied with building an industrial economy and westward expansion. While America turned its attention to European affairs only sporadically, it displayed an intense and growing interest in Latin America and the Far East. Americans' faith in the unique political and moral qualities of their republic accounted, in large part, for their disdain of Europe's supposedly decadent affairs. However, when convinced that European actions threatened their vital interests, Americans responded vigorously and tenaciously.

Origins of the Large Policy: Coveting Colonies. In the post-Civil War years, America began to take hesitant steps toward global policies. The purchase of Alaska and the Midway Islands provided toeholds in the Pacific basin. Attempts to purchase or annex the Hawaiian Islands, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic signaled growing interest in the outside world. By the late 1880s, the United States had begun an active search for external markets for its agricultural and industrial goods. With the so-called closing of the frontier, many Americans looked to overseas expansion. Intellectual trends added impetus to the new global outlook. Anglo-Saxonism, missionary zeal, and the example of European imperialism opened American eyes to the possibilities inherent in expansion. Finally, military and strategic arguments justified a large policy.

Toward an Empire in the Pacific. American interest in the Pacific and the Far East was as old as the Republic itself. The opening of Japan to western trade increased America's interest in the Far East. Despite Chinese protests over the exclusion of their nationals from the United States, trade with China remained brisk. Strategic and commercial concerns made the acquisition of the Hawaiian Islands an increasingly attractive possibility. Growing trade and commercial ties, a substantial American expatriate community, and, after 1887, the presence of an American naval station all pointed toward the annexation of Hawaii. In 1893, Americans in Hawaii deposed Queen Liliuokalani and sought annexation by the United States. Despite opposition from anti-imperialists and some special interests, the United States annexed Hawaii in 1898.

Toward an Empire in Latin America. In addition to traditional commercial interests in Latin America, the United States became increasingly concerned over European influence in the region. In spite of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty (1850), the United States favored an American-owned canal; in 1880, the United States unilaterally abrogated the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. In 1895, a dispute between Venezuela and Great Britain over the boundary between Venezuela and British Guiana nearly brought the United States and Britain to blows. The United States and Great Britain rattled sabers, but war would have served neither side.
Finally, pressed by continental and imperial concerns, Britain agreed to arbitration. After this incident, relations between Britain and America warmed considerably.

**The Cuban Revolution.** Cuban nationalists revolted against Spanish rule in 1895. Spain's brutal response aroused American public opinion in support of the Cubans. President Cleveland offered his services as a mediator, but Spain refused. American expansionists, citizens sympathetic to Cuban independence, and the press (led by Hearst's *Journal* and Pulitzer's *World*) kept the issue alive. The publication of de Lôme's letter and the explosion of the battleship *Maine* in February 1898 pushed the United States and Spain to the brink of war.

**The "Splendid Little" Spanish-American War.** On April 20, 1898, a joint resolution of Congress recognized Cuban independence and authorized the president to use force to expel Spain from the island. The Teller Amendment disclaimed any intent to annex Cuban territory. The purpose of the war was to free Cuba, but the first battles were fought in the Far East, where, on April 30, Commodore Dewey defeated the Spanish fleet at Manila Bay. By August, Americans occupied the Philippines. American forces won a swift victory in Cuba as well. Spain agreed to evacuate Cuba and to cede Puerto Rico and Guam to the United States. The fate of the Philippines was determined at the peace conference held in Paris that October.

**Developing a Colonial Policy.** Almost overnight, the United States had obtained a substantial overseas empire. Some Americans expressed doubts over the acquisition of the Philippines, but expansionists wanted to annex the entire archipelago. Advocates of annexation portrayed the Philippines as markets in their own right and as the gateway to the markets of the Far East. Many Americans, including the president, were swayed by "the general principle of holding on to what we can get."

**The Anti-imperialists.** The Spanish-American war produced a wave of unifying patriotism that furthered sectional reconciliation. However, victory raised new and divisive questions. A diverse group of politicians, business and labor leaders, intellectuals, and reformers spoke out against annexing the Philippines. Some based their opposition on legal and ethical concerns; for others, racial and ethnic prejudice formed the basis of their objections. In the end, swayed by a sense of duty and by practical concerns, McKinley authorized the purchase of the Philippines for $20 million. After a hard-fought battle in the Senate, the expansionists won ratification of the treaty in February 1899.

**The Philippine Insurrection.** Early in 1899, Philippine nationalists, led by Emilio Aguinaldo, took up arms against the American occupation. Atrocities, committed by both sides, became commonplace. Although American casualties and the reports of atrocities committed by American soldiers provided ammunition for the anti-imperialists, McKinley's reelection settled the Philippine question for most Americans. William Howard Taft became the first civilian governor and encouraged participation by the Filipinos in the territorial government. This policy won many converts but did not end the rebellion.
Cuba and the United States. At the onset, the president controlled the fate of America's colonial possessions, but eventually the Congress and the Supreme Court began to participate in this process. The Foraker Act (1900) established a civil government for Puerto Rico. A series of Supreme Court decisions determined that Congress was not bound by the limits of the Constitution in administering a colony. Freedom did not end poverty, illiteracy, or the problem of a collapsing economy in Cuba. The United States paternalistically doubted that the Cuban people could govern themselves and therefore established a military government in 1898. Eventually, the United States withdrew, after doing much to modernize sugar production, improve sanitary conditions, establish schools, and restore orderly administration. A Cuban constitutional convention met in 1900 and proceeded without substantial American interference. Under the terms of the Platt Amendment, the Cubans agreed to American intervention when necessary for the "preservation of Cuban independence," promised to avoid foreign commitments endangering their sovereignty, and agreed to grant American naval bases on their soil. Although American troops occupied Cuba only once more, in 1906, and then at the request of Cuban authorities, the threat of intervention and American economic power gave the United States great influence over Cuba.

The United States in the Caribbean and Central America. The same motives that compelled the United States to intervene in Cuba applied throughout the region. Caribbean nations were economically underdeveloped, socially backward, politically unstable, desperately poor, and threatened by European creditor nations. The United States intervened repeatedly in the region under a broad interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. In 1902, the United States pressed Great Britain and Germany to arbitrate a dispute arising from debts owed them by Venezuela. The Roosevelt administration took control of the Dominican Republic's customs service and used the proceeds to repay that country's European creditors. The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine announced that the United States would not permit foreign nations to intervene in Latin America. Since no other nation could step in, the United States would "exercise...an international police power." In the short run, this policy worked admirably; in the long run, it provoked resentment in Latin America.

The Open Door Policy. When the European powers sought to check Japan's growing economic and military might by carving out spheres of influence in China, the United States felt compelled to act. Secretary of State Hay issued a series of "Open Door" notes, which called upon all powers to honor existing trade agreements with China and to impose no restrictions on trade within their spheres of influence. Although an essentially "toothless" gesture, this action signaled a marked departure from America's isolationist tradition of nonintervention outside of the Western Hemisphere. Within a few months, the Boxer Rebellion tested the Open Door policy. Fearing that European powers would use the rebellion as an excuse for further expropriations, Hay broadened the Open Door policy to include support for the territorial integrity of China. The Open Door notes, America's active diplomatic role in the Russo-Japanese War, and the Gentleman's Agreement of 1907 all engendered ill feelings between the United States and Japan.

The Panama Canal. American policy in the Caribbean centered on the construction of an interoceanic canal, thought to be a necessity for trade and an imperative for national security.
The Hay-Pauncefote Agreement (1901) abrogated the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and ceded to the United States construction rights to such a waterway. The United States negotiated a treaty for the right to build a canal across Panama with the government of Colombia, which the Colombian senate rejected. When the Panamanians rebelled against Colombia in 1903, the United States quickly moved to recognize and insure Panama's independence. The United States then negotiated a treaty with the new Panamanian government, which yielded to the United States a ten-mile-wide canal zone, in perpetuity, for the same monetary terms as those earlier rejected by Colombia.

**Imperialism without Colonies.** America's experiment with territorial imperialism lasted less than a decade. However, through the use of the Open Door policy, the Roosevelt Corollary, and dollar diplomacy, the United States used its industrial, economic, and military might to expand its trade and influence. At times, America also engaged in cultural imperialism, attempting to export American values and the American system to weaker nations. Despite America's emergence as a world power, the national psychology remained fundamentally isolationist.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The sources of increased American interest in foreign affairs and expansion.
2. The circumstances surrounding the annexation of Hawaii.
3. American interests in Latin America.
4. The causes and consequences of the Spanish-American War.
5. The arguments of the imperialists and the anti-imperialists.
6. The events leading to the Philippine Rebellion.
7. The course of events and consequences of America's first colonial war.
8. American relations with Cuba in the years after Cuban independence.
10. The Open Door policy.
12. The events leading to the construction of the Panama Canal.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Discuss the connection between America's emergence as a major industrial power and its expansionist foreign policy.

2. Is it accurate to describe Hay's Open Door policy as an imperial policy for a country without the navy to back up such a policy?

3. How did American expansionism differ from European imperialism?

4. Historians have disagreed over whether the foreign policy of the United States was inspired by excessive idealism or motivated by economic interests (see the “Debating the Past” section). Revisionists such as Walter LaFeber and Thomas McCormick have argued that the United States sought primarily to encourage exports to maintain prosperity at home. What percentage of America’s economic production was exported? Was it sufficient to motivate foreign policy? What kinds of businesses export? What effect might their success or failure have on employment in the United States?

5. Why did Frederick Funston's (See the “American Lives” section) fame evaporate so quickly?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

Edgar Rice Burroughs wrote *Tarzan of the Apes* in the winter of 1911-1912. *All Story* magazine, which ran serialized adventure stories, published Burroughs's work in the fall of 1912. The tale was a great success, and it came out as a novel in 1914.

Burroughs's novel came in the aftermath of America's experiment with imperialism and reflected Burroughs's (and many Americans') ambivalent feelings toward colonialism. While Burroughs volunteered to join Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders (he received a personal note of rejection from Roosevelt), he opposed imperialism and colonialism—perhaps, at least in part, because of his rejection.

Burroughs's attitudes reflected American sensibilities in another respect. Born in 1875 to a middle-class family in Chicago, Burroughs went West several times to seek his fortune but the reality of the West never quite matched his expectations. For one thing, failure came as easily there as it did in the East. He failed in business, as a cowboy, and as a prospector for gold. In 1896, Burroughs even joined the Seventh Cavalry, then stationed in Arizona. He was no more successful at that. He found the duty monotonous and was ill much of the time. For Burroughs, the West was no longer the place to find adventure and romance (if it had ever been). By the time Burroughs sat down to write, disillusioned with the West, Frederick Jackson Turner had already proclaimed the end of the frontier. If the American West no longer qualified as a frontier, Burroughs would find one elsewhere. He set stories on Mars and in medieval Europe. His most successful tale, however, took place on a different "frontier," a place of contact between "civilization" and the jungle, between European colonization and the wild.
Earlier American writers had used the borderlands between civilization and the wild as a setting. James Fenimore Cooper's popular leatherstocking novels took place at civilization's edge. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, Burroughs could not imagine the confrontation between nature and civilization taking place in America, even in the West. It had to be elsewhere. After ransacking his imagination, Burroughs found his ideal location in the outposts of European colonization.

In Burroughs's jungle, natural virtue triumphed; in contrast, civilization was "effeminate," greedy, and overrefined. Civilized humans were, in Burroughs's world, singularly inept at living in the jungle. They were weak and helpless. Their senses had atrophied to the point of uselessness.

Although Burroughs regarded civilization as corrupt and corrupting, his jungle was no paradise. Rather, it was a violent and hierarchical world. Moreover, Burroughs shared many assumptions of the racist society in which he lived. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw the rise of scientific racism. The experiments of August Weismann, which demonstrated that acquired traits were not passed on to the next generation, were interpreted as proof of the inherent inferiority of Asians, Africans, and others. Eugenic thought further buttressed such attitudes, and Burroughs enthusiastically embraced eugenics. In the United States, sectional reconciliation combined with racist attitudes to provide a national acceptance of the South's emerging system of rigid segregation. All of this paved the way for acceptance of American imperialism.

In *Tarzan of the Apes*, however, these ideas coexist with animosity toward colonialism and sympathy for the natives. Yet despite a variety of white evildoers (including pirates, mutineers, cowards, and murderers), many of the worst characters are black. Moreover, the most incompetent character in the novel is Jane Porter's black maid. Burroughs's portrayal of blacks reflects the racist thought of his day. In one episode, the son of a cannibal chief kills Kala, the ape who adopts Tarzan, raises him, and is, for all practical purposes, Tarzan's mother. The description of the Africans reveals much about Burroughs's attitudes.

Across their foreheads were tattooed three parallel lines of color, and on each breast three concentric circles. Their yellow teeth were filed to sharp points, and their great protruding lips added still further to the low and bestial brutishness of their appearance.

Moreover, the black Africans are the losers in a Darwinian struggle; they are being driven from their land by soldiers of white colonial powers. This process provides the backdrop for the events of the novel. John Clayton (Lord Greystoke) is sent on a mission to investigate Belgian abuses of the Africans in a British colony. On the way to Africa, Lord and Lady Greystoke, Tarzan's natural parents, are marooned in the jungle by mutineers. Lord and Lady Greystoke are later murdered by marauding apes, one of whom, Kala, adopts their son as her own. Tarzan is repeatedly drawn to his natural parents' cabin, where he discovers a knife, which he learns to use. He also discovers books and teaches himself to read.

Armed with human weapons and human intelligence, he is able to establish his dominance among the apes. More than that, however, Tarzan comes to realize that he is destined to rule the jungle. The attributes that enable, and entitle, him to rule are a combination of the skills of the jungle, which are learned, and his "civilized" virtues, which
Burroughs attributes to heredity. When he kills Kulonga, who has killed Kala, Tarzan considers eating him.

...he prepared to get down to business, for Tarzan of the Apes was hungry, and here was meat; meat of the kill, which jungle ethics permitted him to eat.

How may we judge him, by what standards, this ape-man with the heart and head and body of an English gentleman, and the training of a wild beast?

Tublat [an ape], whom he had hated and who had hated him, he had killed in a fair fight, and yet never had the thought of eating Tublat's flesh entered his head. It would have been as revolting to him as is cannibalism to us.

But who was Kulonga that he might not be eaten as fairly as Horta, the boar, or Bara, the deer? Was he not simply another of the countless wild things of the jungle who preyed upon one another to satisfy the cravings of hunger?

Suddenly, a strange doubt stayed his hand. Had not his books taught him that he was a man?...

Did men eat men? Alas, he did not know. Why, then, this hesitancy! Once more he essayed the effort, but a qualm of nausea overwhelmed him. He did not understand.

In another episode, Tarzan kills the cruel black ape, Terkoz, and rescues Jane. Much as he is unable to eat Kulonga, he cannot simply follow the law of the jungle and take Jane as his prize. "Now, in every fiber of his being," wrote Burroughs, "heredity spoke louder than training."

Despite Burroughs's distaste for civilization and his opposition to colonialism, his hero, Tarzan, does, in a sense, take up the "white man's burden." Burroughs attributes much of Tarzan's dominance to "hereditary" traits associated with white European culture. These traits enable, and entitle, Tarzan to rule the jungle.

Thus, in spite of his opposition to colonialism, Burroughs in a sense justified white European domination over the jungle, the beasts, and particularly over black men. In many ways, Burroughs reflected the ambivalent feelings of many Americans toward America's imperial venture.

As the text points out, many people, particularly intellectuals, opposed American imperialism. Among the most outspoken opponents was Mark Twain. The first document, written in 1906, appears in Twain's *Autobiography*, compiled by A.B. Paine and published in 1924. The excerpt deals with a particular incident in the military struggle against the Filipinos. The second document, never published in Twain's lifetime, is Twain's appraisal of the American experience in the Philippines. It reflects Twain's thinking on the larger issue of American imperialism.

The third document comes from William Graham Sumner's *War and Other Essays* (1919) but was written in 1898. Known as a social Darwinist, Sumner was also an ardent anti-imperialist. After entering Yale as a student in 1859, Sumner studied abroad after graduation, and returned to teach at Yale until his death in 1910.

Other academics, such as William James, and writers, among them Twain's close friend William Dean Howells, spoke out against imperialism and the war.

Questions for Discussion

1. President McKinley told a delegation of Methodists in 1899 that "there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all and civilize them, and by God's grace do the very best by them as our fellow-men for whom Christ died." What does Twain have to say about the Christianizing mission?

2. Americans made a distinction between European imperialism and America's activities in the Philippines. Does Twain recognize the legitimacy of this distinction? Does Sumner?

3. On what grounds does Sumner base his opposition to American imperialism?
This incident burst upon the world last Friday in an official cablegram from the commander of our forces in the Philippines to our government at Washington. The substance of it was as follows:

A tribe of Moros, dark-skinned savages, had fortified themselves in the bowl of an extinct crater not many miles from Jolo; and as they were hostiles, and bitter against us because we have been trying for eight years to take their liberties away from them, their presence in that position was a menace. Our commander, General Leonard Wood, ordered a reconnaissance [sic]. It was found that the Moros numbered six hundred, counting women and children; that their crater bowl was in the summit of a peak or mountain twenty-two hundred feet above sea level, and very difficult of access for Christian troops and artillery.... Our troops climbed the heights by devious and difficult trails, and even took some artillery with them....[When they] arrived at the rim of the crater, the battle began. Our soldiers numbered five hundred and forty. They were assisted by auxiliaries consisting of a detachment of native constabulary in our pay—their numbers not given—and by a naval detachment, whose numbers are not stated. But apparently the contending parties were about equal as to number—six hundred men on our side, on the edge of the bowl; six hundred men, women, and children in the bottom of the bowl. Depth of the bowl, 50 feet.

General Wood's order was, "Kill or capture the six hundred."

The battle began—it is officially called by that name—our forces firing down into the crater with their artillery and their deadly small arms of precision; the savages furiously returning the fire, probably with brickbats—though this is merely a surmise of mine, as the weapons used by the savages are not nominated in the cablegram. Heretofore the Moros have used knives and clubs mainly; also ineffectual trade-muskets when they had any.

The official report stated that the battle was fought with prodigious energy on both sides during a day and a half, and that it ended with a complete victory for the American arms. The completeness of the victory is established by this fact: that of the six hundred Moros not one was left alive. The brilliancy of the victory is established by this other fact, to wit: that of our six hundred heroes only fifteen lost their lives.

General Wood was present and looking on. His order had been, "Kill or capture those savages." Apparently our little army considered that the 'or' left them authorized to kill or capture according to taste, and that their taste had remained what it has been for eight years, in our army out there—the taste of Christian butchers....

Let us now consider two or three details of our military history. In one of the great battles of the Civil War ten per cent of the forces engaged on the two sides were killed and wounded. At Waterloo, where four hundred thousand men were present on the two sides, fifty thousand fell, killed and wounded, in five hours, leaving three hundred and fifty sound and all right for further adventures. Eight years ago, when the pathetic comedy called the Cuban War was played, we summoned two hundred and fifty thousand men. We fought a number of showy battles, and when the war was over we had lost two hundred sixty-eight men out of our two hundred and fifty thousand, in killed and wounded in the field, and just fourteen times as many by the gallantry of the army doctors in the hospitals and camps. We did not exterminate the Spaniards—far from it. In each engagement we left an average of two per cent of the enemy killed or crippled on the field.
Contrast these things with the great statistics which have arrived from that Moro crater! There, with six hundred engaged on each side, we lost fifteen men killed outright, and we had thirty-two wounded....The enemy numbered six hundred—including women and children—and we abolished them utterly, leaving not even a baby alive to cry for its dead mother. *This is incomparably the greatest victory that was ever achieved by the Christian soldiers of the United States.*
Mark Twain, "Summary of the Philippine `Incident' (1899)

We may now take an account of stock and find out how much we have made by the speculation—or lost. The Government went into the speculation on certain definite grounds which it believed from the viewpoint of statesmanship, to be good & sufficient. To wit: 1, for the sake of the money supposed to be in it; 2, in order to become a World power and get a back seat in the Family of Nations.

We have scored on number 2. We have secured a back seat in the Family of Nations. We have scored it & [are] trying to enjoy the tacks that are in it. We are a World Power, no one can deny it, a brass-gilt one, a tuppence, ha'penny one, but a World Power just the same. We have bought some islands from a party that did not own them; with real smartness & a good counterfeit of disinterested friendliness, we coaxed a weak nation into a trap, & closed it upon them; we went back on our honored guest of the stars & stripes when we had no further use for him, & chased him into the mountains; we are as indisputably in possession of a wide-spreading archipelago as if it were our property; we have pacified some thousands of the islanders & buried them; destroyed their fields; burned their villages & turned their widows & orphans out of doors; furnished heart-breaking exile to dozens of disagreeable patriots & subjugated the remaining millions by Benevolent Assimilation which is the pious new name of the musket; we have acquired property in the three hundred concubines & other slaves of our business-partner, the Sultan of Sulu, & hoisted our protecting flag over that swag.

And so, by these provinces of God—the phrase is the Government's, not mine—we are a World Power; & are glad & proud, & have a Back Seat in the Family. With tacks in it. At least we are letting on to be glad & proud; & it is the best way. Indeed, it is the only way. We must maintain our dignity for people are looking....
There is not a civilized nation that does not talk about its civilizing mission just as grandly as we do. The English, who really have more to boast of it in this respect than anybody else, talk least about it, but the Phariseeism with which they correct and instruct other people has made them hated all over the globe. The French believe themselves the guardians of the highest and purest culture, and that the eyes of all mankind are fixed on Paris, whence they expect oracles of thought and taste. The Germans regard themselves as charged with a mission, especially to us Americans, to save us from egoism and materialism. The Russians, in their books and newspapers, talk about the civilizing mission of Russia in language that might be translated from some of the finest paragraphs of our imperialistic newspapers.

The first principle of Mohammedanism is that we Christians are dogs and infidels, fit only to be enslaved or butchered by Moslems. It is a corollary that wherever Mohammedanism extends it carries, in the belief of its votaries, the highest blessings, and that the whole human race would be enormously elevated if Mohammedanism should supplant Christianity everywhere.

To come, last, to Spain, the Spaniards have, for centuries, considered themselves the most zealous and self-sacrificing Christians, especially charged by the Almighty, on this account, to spread the true religion and civilization over the globe. They think themselves free and noble, leaders in refinement and the sentiments of personal honor, and they despise us as sordid money-grabbers and heretics. I could bring you passages from peninsular authors of the first rank about the grand role of Spain and Portugal in spreading freedom and truth.

Now each nation laughs at all the others when it observes these manifestations of national vanity. You may rely upon it that they are all ridiculous by virtue of these pretensions, including ourselves. The point is that each of them repudiates the standards of the others, and the outlying nations, which are to be civilized, hate all the standards of civilized men.

We assume that what we like and practice, and what we think better, must come as a welcome blessing to Spanish-Americans and Filipinos. This is grossly and obviously untrue. They hate our ways. They are hostile to our ideas. Our religion, language, institutions, and manners offend them. They like their own ways, and if we appear amongst them as rulers, there will be social discord in all the great departments of social interest. The most important thing which we shall inherit from the Spaniards will be the task of suppressing rebellions.

If the United States takes out of the hands of Spain her mission, on the ground that Spain is not executing it well, and if this nation in its turn attempts to be schoolmistress to others, it will shrivel up into the same vanity and self-conceit of which Spain now presents an example. To read our current literature one would think that we were already well on the way to it.
Now, the great reason why all these enterprises which begin by saying to somebody else, "We know what is good for you better than you know yourself and we are going to make you do it," are false and wrong is that they violate liberty; or, to turn the same statement into other words, the reason why liberty, of which we Americans talk so much, is a good thing is that it means leaving people to live out their own lives in their own way, while we do the same. If we believe in liberty, as an American principle, why do we not stand by it? Why are we going to throw it away to enter upon a Spanish policy of dominion and regulation?
CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Wilson's "Moral" Diplomacy. Wilson set the moral tone for his foreign policy by denouncing dollar diplomacy. In some matters, idealism provided an adequate basis for foreign policy. He persuaded Japan to modify the harshness of its Twenty-one Demands (1915) against China. Where vital interests were concerned, however, the primacy of America's interests outweighed Wilson's idealism. The importance of the Panama Canal made Wilson unwilling to tolerate unrest in the Caribbean. Wilson's most fervent missionary diplomacy manifested itself in Mexico, where his personal abhorrence of the Mexican dictator, Victoriano Huerta, led to American military intervention in Mexico's internal affairs.

Europe Explodes in War. When World War I broke out in Europe, most Americans believed that the conflict did not concern them. Wilson promptly issued a proclamation of neutrality. The war's affront to progressive ideals, combined with the traditional American fear of entanglement in European affairs, provided ample justification for neutrality. Though most Americans wanted to stay out of the war, nearly all were partial to one side or the other. People of German, Austrian, and Irish descent sympathized with the Central Powers; the majority, however, influenced by the ties of Anglo-American culture and successful Allied propaganda, sided with the Allies.

Freedom of the Seas. Anticipating the economic benefits of trading with all belligerents, the United States found Britain's control of the Atlantic frustrating. Britain declared nearly all commodities to be contraband of war. Although British tactics frequently exasperated Wilson, they did not result in the loss of innocent lives. Therefore, Wilson never seriously considered an embargo. Given British naval superiority and the economic importance of America, any action by the United States inevitably had a negative impact on one side or the other. Ultimately, increased trade with the Allies and profits from loans to France and England tied America more closely to the Allies. In addition, Germany's use of submarine warfare brought new questions to issues of naval warfare and neutral rights. Extremely vulnerable on the surface and too small to carry survivors, U-boats could not play by the old rules of war. The result was often a heavy loss of life. The sinking of the Lusitania (May 1915), with the loss of 128 American lives, brought an outcry from the American public. After dragging out the controversy for nearly a year, Germany apologized and agreed to pay an indemnity. The sinking of the Sussex in 1916 produced another strong American protest, which led the Germans to promise, in the Sussex pledge, to stop sinking merchant ships without warning.

The Election of 1916. Facing a unified Republican party in 1916, Wilson sought to gain support from progressives. He nominated Lewis D. Brandeis to the Supreme Court, signed
the Farm Loan Act, approved the Keating-Owens Child Labor Act and a workmen's
compensation package for federal employees, and modified his stance on the tariff. In doing
so, Wilson put into effect much of the Progressive Party platform of 1912. Wilson's
maintenance of American neutrality and his progressive domestic policies won for him a
narrow victory over Republican challenger Charles Evans Hughes.

**The Road to War.** In an effort to mediate the European conflict, Wilson sent his advisor,
Colonel Edward M. House, to negotiate with the belligerents. After the failure of the House
mission, America moved ever closer to intervention. Europe refused to respond to Wilson's
plea in January 1917 for peace without victory. After that, a series of events led the United
States closer to war. Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare in February. The
Zimmermann telegram was released in March, after which Wilson authorized the arming of
American merchantmen. On April 2, 1917, Wilson requested that Congress declare war on
Germany. On April 6, the Senate voted 82 to 6 and the House 373 to 50 in favor of war.

**Mobilizing the Economy.** Although America's entry into the war assured an Allied victory,
the conversion of America's economy to a wartime footing proceeded slowly, and the war
ended before much of the process was complete. Conscription did not begin to mobilize the
nation's military manpower until September 1917. After several false starts, Wilson created
the War Industries Board (WIB) to direct industrial mobilization. America was more
successful in mobilizing food supplies under the leadership of Herbert Hoover, a mining
engineer and former head of the Belgian Relief Commission, who was appointed to supervise
agricultural production. Wartime government planning and regulation began a new era in
cooperation between government and business.

**Workers in Wartime.** The demands of a wartime economy, coupled with a shortage of labor,
improved the lot of American labor. Immigration was reduced to a trickle; wages rose; and
unemployment disappeared. Manpower shortages created new employment opportunities
for blacks, women, and other disadvantaged groups. Blacks left the South for jobs in northern
factories. While the government did act to forestall strikes, its actions also opened the way
for the unionization of many previously unorganized industries.

**Paying for the War.** The war cost the federal government about $33.5 billion, not counting
pensions and other postwar expenses. Government borrowing financed over two-thirds of
the war's cost. In addition to direct loans, the sale of Liberty and Victory bonds raised
millions. A steeply graduated income tax, increased inheritance taxes, and an excess-profits
tax helped the federal government raise over $10.5 billion in tax monies.

**Propaganda and Civil Liberties.** To rally public support, Wilson named George Creel to
head the newly created Committee on Public Information (CPI). The CPI churned out
propaganda portraying the war as a crusade for freedom and democracy. In the midst of
wartime hysteria, little distinction was made between constitutionally guaranteed rights of
dissent and illegal acts of sedition or treason. While Wilson sometimes spoke in defense of
free speech, his actions contradicted those words. He signed the Espionage Act of 1917 and
the Sedition Act of 1918, which went far beyond what was necessary to protect the national interest.

**Wartime Reforms.** America's wartime experience was part and product of the Progressive Era. The exigencies of war opened the way for government involvement in many social and economic areas. A new generation of professionally educated, reform-minded individuals found employment in the federal bureaucracy, and it appeared that the war was creating a sense of common purpose that might stimulate the public to cooperate to achieve selfless goals. Women's suffrage, economic opportunities for blacks, gains in workmen's compensation, and prohibition were but a few of the reforms of the war era.

**Women and Blacks in Wartime.** Women found employment in new fields during the war, but for the majority these gains were short-lived. Traditional views of a "woman's role," the desire to rehire veterans, and the opposition of many unions prevented women from consolidating their employment gains. More than a half million southern blacks moved north to the booming cities between 1914 and 1919. Migrating blacks met with hostility and, on occasion, violence; however, many realized an improvement in their social and political status. Blacks who joined the armed forces served in segregated units. The majority of black servicemen were assigned to support and labor units, but many did fight and die for their country. Altogether about 200,000 blacks served in Europe. Many blacks, including W.E.B. Du Bois, hoped that their patriotism would bring political equality when the war was over.

**Americans: To the Trenches and Over the Top.** More than 2 million Americans served in Europe. Although the American Expeditionary Force (AEF), under the command of General Pershing, reached France on July 4, 1917, American forces did not see action until the battles of Château-Thierry, Belleau Wood, and Soissons in 1918. America's largest engagement, the drive west through the Argonne Forest, involved over 1.2 million men and proved instrumental in ending the war. In November 1918, an armistice ended the Great War. American casualties totaled 112,432 dead and 230,074 wounded.

**Preparing for Peace.** Although hostilities ended in November, the shape of postwar Europe had yet to be decided. The Central Powers, Germany in particular, anticipated a settlement based on Wilson's Fourteen Points. The victors, especially England and France, found many provisions of the Fourteen Points unacceptable. Wilson journeyed to Paris and attempted personally to guide the course of the peace conference. With Wilson out of the country and preoccupied with the peace conference, the domestic political situation deteriorated. There was growing discontent over his farm and tax policies; despite its gains during the war, labor was restive. Moreover, Wilson had exacerbated his political difficulties by making a partisan appeal for the election of a Democratic Congress in 1918. Republicans won majorities in both houses, and Wilson faced a hostile Congress. The President compounded his problems by failing to appoint any leading Republicans or any members of the Senate to the peace commission, thus making it less likely that the Senate would ratify the treaty.

of Italy, dominated the Paris Peace Conference. Far more concerned over security, war guilt, and reparations than Wilsonian goals of justice and international harmony, the European victors all but ignored Wilsonian goals of open diplomacy, freedom of the seas, and national self-determination. Wilson expected that the League of Nations would make up for deficiencies in the Versailles Treaty.

**The Senate Rejects League of Nations.** To pacify American opponents, Wilson persuaded the Great Powers to exclude "domestic questions," such as tariff and immigration policies and the Monroe Doctrine from the purview of the League; but this did not ensure its acceptance with Americans. Senate Republicans split into three anti-League camps. The "irreconcilables" rejected League membership on any terms. The "mild reservationists" backed membership, subject to minor revisions of the League's charter. The majority Republican opposition, the "strong reservationists" led by Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, would accept the League only if American sovereignty were fully protected. Wilson refused to yield any ground and undertook a nationwide speaking tour to rally support for the treaty. At Pueblo, Colorado, Wilson collapsed and had to return to Washington. Wilson rejected all compromise, and the Senate rejected the Treaty.

**Demobilization.** Almost immediately after signing the Armistice, the government removed its economic controls, blithely assuming that the economy could readjust itself without direction. Millions of men were demobilized rapidly. These swift and unregulated changes in the economy soon created problems. Inflation spiraled; by 1920 the cost of living stood at twice the level of 1913. During 1919, one out of five employees engaged in strike actions. Then came a precipitous economic decline; between July 1920 and March 1922, prices fell and unemployment surged.

**The Red Scare.** Labor unrest, fear of Bolshevism, failure to distinguish between unions and communism, economic flux, and the xenophobic tenor of wartime propaganda fostered near hysteria in postwar America and led to the phenomenon known as the Red Scare. In January 1920, Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer organized a series of raids against radicals. Of the more than 6,000 "radical" foreigners seized, only 556 proved liable to deportation. When the massive uprising that Palmer predicted for May Day 1920 failed to materialize, the Red Scare swiftly subsided.

**The Election of 1920.** The Democrats nominated James A. Cox of Ohio, who favored membership in the League. The Republican nominee, Warren G. Harding, also of Ohio, equivocated on the issue, despite his Senate record as a strong reservationist. Harding's smashing victory over Cox signaled more than America's rejection of the League. The voters' response to Harding's call for a return to "normalcy" suggested that Americans sought an end to the period of agitation and reform that had begun with Theodore Roosevelt.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. Wilson's moralistic approach to foreign policy.

2. The influence of economic concerns on American diplomacy in the years preceding American entry into World War I.

3. The impact of the election of 1916 on Wilson's domestic policies.

4. Events leading to the American entry into World War I.

5. The mobilization of the American economy for war and its impact.

6. In what ways did the war produce expanded economic opportunities for minorities and women.

7. The outbreak of intolerance during the war.

8. Wilson's Fourteen Points and the failure of the Treaty of Versailles to incorporate them.

9. The rejection of the Treaty of Versailles by the Senate.


11. The causes of the Red Scare.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Wilson attempted to raise the moral tone of American foreign policy. Is moralism an adequate or even a wise basis for foreign policy?

2. The United States remained neutral for much of World War I. During that time, America encountered difficulties with both Britain and Germany. Is it possible for a major power to be genuinely neutral in a major war? If the United States refused to trade with all belligerents, did that not neutralize Britain's naval supremacy? If the United States agreed to trade with all parties, did that not work to Germany's disadvantage because of Britain's naval supremacy?

3. Did World War I represent the end of the Progressive Era or its culmination?

4. What long-term impact did the black migration to the North have? For example, although they faced discrimination, blacks could vote in the North. Moreover,
residential discrimination concentrated blacks (and therefore black voters) in certain areas of a city. This could result in greater political influence. What consequences might flow from this?

5. Some scholars, most notably the distinguished historian Arthur S. Link and the physician Edwin Weinstein, have attributed Wilson’s refusal to compromise over the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations to Wilson’s failing health (see the “Debating the Past” section). Consider Wilson’s presidency at Princeton University (discussed both in Chapter 22 and in this chapter). How does that contradict the idea that illness made Wilson unable to compromise? To what degree and in what ways might Wilson’s illness have contributed to his refusal to compromise over the League?

6. The American Lives essay on Harry Truman fails to mention that, before World War I, Truman had tried his hand at a number of occupations and made a success of none. The war offered Truman opportunity. In what ways does Truman's experience seem typical? In what ways was it not typical?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

America's entry into World War I presented serious threats to civil liberties. Not since the Alien and Sedition Acts of the 1790s had there been such a campaign against dissent. The Espionage Act (1917) provided for the punishment of those making or conveying false reports to promote the success of the enemy; those seeking to cause disobedience, disloyalty, or mutiny in the armed forces; and those obstructing enlistment in the armed forces. It also punished the mailing of any matter advocating treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to any law of the United States.

The Sedition Act (1918) made it a crime to obstruct the sale of government bonds or to "utter or publish words intended to bring into contempt or disrepute the government of the United States, flag, uniform, etc. or to incite resistance to government or promote the cause of its enemies."

The government vigorously enforced these laws; 1,956 cases were brought, resulting in 877 convictions.

Setting aside for a moment the clear denial of rights protected by the First Amendment, the arrests made under these acts made clear the real targets of the government: the IWW, leaders of the Socialist party, leaders of the Nonpartisan League, anarchists, pacifists.

These prosecutions gave rise to a series of cases that shaped modern First Amendment law. The Supreme Court handed down three decisions involving these laws in the spring of 1919. Schenk v. U.S. involved the conviction of Schenk, a prominent socialist leader, and others for inciting young men to resist the draft. Their crime was having mailed circulars opposing the war and the draft that described the draft as a violation of the Thirteenth Amendment. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote for the majority. Holmes admitted that "in many places and in ordinary times" the defendants were within their constitutional rights to say what was in the pamphlets. "But," continued Holmes, "the
character of every act depends on the circumstances in which it was done." In the most famous line of the decision, the justice observed that "the most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theatre."

This led Holmes to conclude that "the question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent." The court upheld the conviction.

One week later, the court handed down two more decisions, *Frohwerk v. U.S.* and *Debs v. U.S.* Frohwerk, the editor of a German language newspaper, had published articles challenging the constitutionality of the draft and the merits and purposes of the war. The Supreme Court upheld his conviction under the Espionage Act.

Eugene V. Debs, the leader of the Socialist party, gave a speech in which he denounced the war as a capitalist plot and supported fellow socialists convicted of resisting the draft. He was prosecuted for creating insubordination in the armed forces, convicted, and sentenced to ten years in prison. Holmes, once again writing for the majority, accepted the jury's verdict that Debs intended to interfere with the war.

These three cases shocked civil libertarians, especially since the author of the decisions was a man they trusted to protect individual rights. The "clear and present danger" test, which civil libertarians later would claim as a protection of free speech, originated as a rationalization for sending men to jail.

In three cases the next term, Holmes and Louis Brandeis began to express dissenting views. *Abrams v. U.S.* involved an obscure Russian Jewish immigrant from New York's Lower East Side. He was convicted for publishing and distributing leaflets attacking the sending of American troops to Archangel and Murmansk. The government had trouble proving that this actually obstructed the war effort; it claimed that Abrams's activities had a tendency to provoke armed revolts and strikes and therefore reduce the supply of munitions. A majority of the court upheld the conviction. Holmes and Brandeis dissented. Holmes objected to the use of his clear and present danger test to suppress this kind of dissent. "It is only the present danger of immediate evil or an intent to bring it about," wrote Holmes, "that warrants Congress in setting a limit to the expression of opinion where private rights are not concerned."

*Schaeffer v. U.S.* involved five defendants connected with a German language paper in Philadelphia who were accused of printing unpatriotic articles critical of the Allies and favorable to the Central Powers. Once again, the majority voted to uphold the convictions. The last of the major Espionage Act cases, *Pierce v. U.S.*, involved the prosecution of three socialists for distributing an antiwar pamphlet. A majority of the Court again upheld the convictions.

Caught up in the fervor of a war to defend freedom and democracy abroad, the Congress and Supreme Court of the United States acted to undermine freedom at home.

DOCUMENTS

Introduction

Even as African Americans enlisted to fight for freedom, they faced segregation in the armed forces and discrimination at home. Reverend Francis J. Grimké of Washington, D.C., was bitterly aware of the contradiction. Grimké was born near Charleston, South Carolina. His mother was a slave, his father her white owner. His father was also a brother of Sarah and Angelina Grimké, two well-known abolitionists and advocates of women's rights. After the Civil War, Francis attended Lincoln University and went on to become a prominent clergyman in Washington, D.C.

The first document reveals Grimké's attitude toward purchasing Liberty Bonds. The second document is from an address Grimké delivered to returning black soldiers in Washington in 1919.

W.E.B. Du Bois also wrote about the significance of black soldiers at the end of World War I. Du Bois, a native of Massachusetts, received his Ph.D. from Harvard University and made a career as a teacher at Atlanta University. He was a critic of Booker T. Washington's accommodationist approach, a founder of the Niagra Movement, and a founding member of the NAACP (see Introduction to Documents, Chapter 17). Du Bois edited the Crisis, the official organ of the NAACP, in which the third document appeared.

Questions for Discussion

1. Grimké seems to be proud of African Americans who fought for their country. Is there a contradiction between that pride and his refusal to purchase Liberty Bonds? If so, why? If not, why not?

2. What does Grimké hope that blacks will gain from their participation in the war?

3. Why does Grimké place a special burden on the returning soldiers?

4. What are the similarities between Grimké's "Address of Welcome to the Men Who Have Returned from the Battlefront" and Du Bois's "Returning Soldiers?" What are the differences? On whom does Grimké place the primary burden for the struggle for equality? On whom does Du Bois place it? Who is Grimké's intended audience? What about Du Bois?
October 16, 1918

It has never occurred to me before today to ask the question, Why the several loans that have been solicited by the United States Government, are called Liberty Loans, or Bonds. The alleged reason is because the money raised is to be used in defense of Liberty. Liberty is certainly worth fighting for, worth dying for, worth defending with the last drop of blood, and with the last dollar; but it must be liberty—liberty which has to do with the rights of all men regardless of race or color. Liberty in that sense, is not the liberty, however, for which these loans are solicited, but liberty for white men only. It cannot mean resistance to injustice, oppression, wrong wherever found, and against whomsoever practiced. For right here in this boasted land of the free, the very men who are calling for a loan to defend liberty are the oppressors, are the ones who are trampling upon the rights of ten millions of colored people. I have never subscribed a dollar to any of these Liberty Loans: and never will. To do so would be to endorse the American Idea of liberty. How can any colored man, with a particle of self-respect, endorse such an idea? And yet that is just what he does when he subscribes to these liberty bonds. He does it, knowing full well that it is not his liberty that is being thought of, or about which there is any concern. Until liberty means liberty for all, for the black man as well as for the white man, not one cent of my money shall go to help make such a fund. One of the surprising things is that men are being called upon to lay down their lives and to give of their means to safeguard Liberty as the most precious of all possessions, and yet nothing so excites the ire of the white man in this country as an attempt on the part of a colored man to stand up for his rights as an American citizen and as a man. Liberty is a precious thing in the estimation of these white hypocrites, when it has to do with the rights of white men, but counts for nothing when it has to do with the rights of colored men. And they know it: and yet they have the audacity, the brazen effrontery to proclaim themselves the champions of liberty: Liberty long since would have perished from the earth if her fate depended upon such defenders.
F. J. Grimké, "Address of Welcome to the Men Who Have Returned from the Battlefront" (1919)

Young gentlemen, I am glad to welcome you home again after months of absence in a foreign land in obedience to the call of your country—glad that you have returned to us without any serious casualties.

I am sure you have acquitted yourself well; that in the record that you have made for yourselves, during your absence from home, there is nothing to be ashamed of, nothing that will reflect any discredit upon the race with which you are identified....

While you were away you had the opportunity of coming in contact with another than the American type of white man; and through that contact you have learned what it is to be treated as a man, regardless of the color of your skin or race identity. Unfortunately you had to go away from home to receive a man's treatment, to breathe the pure, bracing air of liberty, equality, fraternity. And, while it was with no intention of bringing to you that knowledge, of putting you where you could get that kind of experience, but simply because they couldn't very well get along without you, I am glad nevertheless, that you were sent. You know now that the mean, contemptible spirit of race prejudice that curses this land is not the spirit of other lands; you know now what it is to be treated as a man. And, one of the things that I am particularly hoping for, now that you have had this experience, is that you have come back determined, as never before, to keep up the struggle for our rights until, here in these United States, in this boasted land of the free and home of the brave, every man, regardless of the color of his skin, shall be accorded a man's treatment.

Your trip will be of very little value to the race in this country unless you have come back with the love of liberty, equality, fraternity burning in your souls....In the struggle that is before us, you can do a great deal in helping to better conditions. You, who gave up everything—home, friends, relatives—you who took your lives in your hands and went forth to lay them, a willing sacrifice upon the altar of your country and in the interest of democracy throughout the world, have a right to speak—to speak with authority; and that right you must exercise.

We, who remained at home, followed you while you were away, with the deepest interest; and, our hearts burned with indignation when tidings came to us, as it did from time to time, of the manner in which you were treated by those over you, from whom you had every reason, in view of the circumstances that took you abroad and what it was costing you, to expect decent, humane treatment, instead of the treatment that was accorded you. The physical hardships, incident to a soldier's life in times of war, are trying enough, are hard enough to bear—and, during this world war, on the other side of the water, I understand they were unusually hard. To add to these the insults, the studied insults that were heaped upon you, and for no reason except that you were colored, is so shocking that were it not for positive evidence, it would be almost unbelievable....
I know of nothing that sets forth this cursed American race prejudice in a more odious, execrable light than the treatment of our colored soldiers in this great world struggle that has been going on, by the very government that ought to have shielded them from the brutes that were over them....

If it was worth going abroad to make the world safe for democracy, it is equally worth laboring no less earnestly to make it safe at home. We shall be greatly disappointed if you do not do this—if you fail to do your part.
W.E.B. DuBois, "Returning Soldiers" (1919)

We are returning from war. The Crisis and tens of thousands of black men were drafted into a great struggle. For bleeding France and what she means and has meant and will mean to us and humanity and against the threat of German race arrogance, we fought gladly and to the last drop of blood; for America and her highest ideals, we fought in far-off hope; for the dominant southern oligarchy entrenched in Washington, we fought in bitter resignation. For the America that represents and gloats in lynching, disfranchisement, caste, brutality, and devilish insult—for this, in the hateful upturning and mixing of things, we were forced by vindictive fate to fight, also.

But to-day we return! We return from the slavery of uniform which the world's madness demanded us to don to the freedom of civil garb. We stand again to look America squarely in the face and call a spade a spade. We sing: This country of ours, despite all its better souls have done and dreamed, is yet a shameful land.

It lynches....
It disfranchises its own citizens....
It encourages ignorance....
It steals from us....
It insults us....

This is the country to which we Soldiers of Democracy return. This is the fatherland for which we fought! But it is our fatherland. It was right for us to fight. The faults of our country are our faults. Under similar circumstances, we would fight again. But by the God of Heaven, we are cowards and jackasses if now that that war is over, we do not marshal every ounce of our brain and brawn to fight a sterner, longer, more unbending battle against the forces of hell in our own land.

We return.
We return from fighting.
We return fighting.

Make way for Democracy! We saved it in France, and by the Great Jehovah, we sill save it in the United States of America, or know the reason why.
CHAPTER 25

*Postwar Society and Culture: Change and Adjustment*

**CHAPTER OVERVIEW**

*Closing the Gates to New Immigrants.* Xenophobia did not cease with the passing of the Red Scare. As millions of Europeans attempted to flee their continent's devastation, Congress acted to bar their entry into the United States. Bowing to nativist pressures, especially against southern and eastern Europeans, Congress established entry quotas based on national origin. Congress restricted overall immigration to a maximum of 150,000 in 1929. Dislike of the new immigrants, many of whom were Jewish, was related to a general growth of anti-Semitism.

*New Urban Social Patterns.* The 1920 census revealed, for the first time, that urban Americans (defined as those living in a community of 2,500 or more) outnumbered rural Americans. City life affected family structure, employment, and educational and cultural opportunities. Ethnic background, socioeconomic status, and family size played significant roles in determining whether women worked outside the home and, if they did work, women's work patterns. Compulsory education laws and child labor legislation limited the number of children working. New ideas about family life, such as companionate marriage, contraception, scientific child rearing, and more easily obtainable divorces, gained currency. The impersonality of large cities loosened constraints on sexuality. Homosexuals developed a distinct culture.

*The Younger Generation.* The failure to achieve the idealistic goals of America's entry into World War I created a feeling of alienation among young adults. However, popular notions of the Jazz Age only superficially reflected reality. Young people behaved in unconventional ways because they were adjusting to more rapid changes than previous generations. Trends barely perceptible during the Progressive Era reached avalanche proportions. Patterns of courtship changed; respectable women smoked cigarettes in public; women cast off corsets, wore lipstick, shortened their hair, and shortened their skirts. Parents worried about the breakdown of all moral standards, but many facets of the youth rebellion reflected a conformity to peer pressure. Young people's new ways of relating to each other were not mere fads and were not confined to people under thirty.

*The "New" Woman.* Margaret Sanger, a political radical concerned about poor women who lacked knowledge of contraception, led the battle for birth control. Sanger encountered legal, religious, and societal barriers but helped win wide acceptance for birth control. Other gender-based restrictions slowly broke down. Many states modified divorce laws to protect women's rights. More women attended college and worked, but women earned less than men and were excluded from many management positions. Radical feminists realized that voting did not guarantee equality; they founded the Women's Party and campaigned for an equal
rights amendment. Less radical women founded the League of Women Voters and campaigned for broad social reforms.

**Popular Culture: Movies and Radio.** Popular culture changed dramatically as moving pictures grew in sophistication and appeal. The introduction of sound in 1927 brought a new level of technological maturity. Filmmakers like D.W. Griffith created an entirely new art. Radio exerted an even greater impact. Radio soon brought a wide variety of public events into American homes. By using radio to spread its messages, the advertising industry subsidized the nascent medium. Because advertisers sought mass markets, however, they preferred uncontroversial, intellectually light programs.

**The Golden Age of Sports.** Prosperity, increased leisure time, radio, and advertising dollars all promoted the extraordinary popularity of sports in the 1920s. Sports heroes such as Harold "Red" Grange, Jack Dempsey, Bill Tilden, and Babe Ruth enthralled the American public. New stadiums filled with capacity crowds. Radio brought the action into the living rooms of millions. Football became the dominant college sport, and tens of thousands of Americans took up participatory sports such as tennis, golf, and water sports.

**Urban-Rural Conflicts: Fundamentalism.** Rural America viewed cities as hotbeds of decadence, sin, and overt materialism. Religious fundamentalism emerged as a reaction of rural conservatives toward the perceived excesses of urban culture. The Scopes "Monkey Trial" typified the conflict between fundamentalism and modernism. John T. Scopes, a biology teacher, in cooperation with the American Civil Liberties Union, defied a Tennessee law banning the teaching of evolution in public schools. Clarence Darrow represented Scopes, while William Jennings Bryan represented the state (and, in a larger sense, rural, fundamentalist America). Although Scopes was convicted, the trial exposed the ignorance and danger of the fundamentalist position.

**Urban-Rural Conflicts: Prohibition.** Ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment (1919), which prohibited the manufacture, transportation, and sale of alcoholic beverages, signaled a great victory for the forces of rural conservatism. Alcohol abuse declined during the "noble experiment"; however, the illegal trade in "booze" spawned corruption. By the end of the decade, it was readily apparent that prohibition had failed, but powerful moral and political forces prevented modification or repeal.

**The Ku Klux Klan.** The new Ku Klux Klan, founded in 1915 by William J. Simmons, achieved a peak membership of five million in 1923. Its targets included immigrants, Jews, and Catholics, as well as blacks. Using appeals to patriotism, nativism, morality, and traditional Americanism, the Klan found supporters primarily in middle-sized cities, small towns, and villages in the middle western and western states. Factionalism and misconduct by leaders weakened the Klan. By the late twenties, it was in decline; in 1930, it had only nine thousand members.

**Sacco and Vanzetti.** In 1921, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti were convicted of murdering a paymaster and a guard during a holdup in Massachusetts. The two men were
Italian immigrants and anarchists. Irrespective of their guilt or innocence, their trial was a travesty of justice. After years of appeals, the two men were executed. The case contributed to the disillusion and alienation of many intellectuals.

**Literary Trends.** The horrors of World War I combined with the antics of fundamentalists and red baiters led intellectuals to abandon the hopeful experimentation of the prewar period. Intellectuals became critics of society. Out of this alienation came a major literary flowering. F. Scott Fitzgerald symbolized this "lost generation" and captured its spirit in his novels, *This Side of Paradise* and *The Great Gatsby*. Some writers and artists became expatriates. The most talented of this group, Ernest Hemingway, became the symbol of the expatriate American intellectual. *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms* revealed a sense of outrage at life's meaninglessness. Even more than Hemingway's ideas, his sparse literary style accounts for his towering reputation. Edith Wharton wrote about New York's nineteenth century elite in a traditional style reminiscent of Henry James. H. L. Mencken reflected the distaste of intellectuals for the climate of the times. The most popular writer of the 1920s, Sinclair Lewis, portrayed the smug ignorance and bigotry of the American small town in *Main Street*. In *Babbitt*, *Arrowsmith*, and *Elmer Gantry*, Lewis presented scathing indictments of business, the medical profession, and religion. Along with new literary styles, the twenties witnessed innovations in the distribution of literature, most notably founding of the Book-of-the-Month Club. The club introduced thousands to new writers, including women writers. For the most part, however, its offerings tended toward the orthodox. One did not find Hemingway, Faulkner, or Fitzgerald among the Club's offerings.

**The "New Negro."** Southern blacks continued to migrate to the North. While blacks in northern cities had always tended to live together, the tendency toward concentration continued and produced ghettos. The disappointment of their wartime expectations led to a new militancy among blacks. W.E.B. Du Bois vacillated between integration and black nationalism. Marcus Garvey had no such ambivalence; his Universal Negro Improvement Association stressed black pride and a return to Africa. Black leaders like Du Bois considered Garvey a charlatan. Garvey was convicted of defrauding thousands of his supporters when his steamship line went bankrupt. The northern ghettos produced some compensating advantages. Concentrations of black populations enabled them to elect representatives to state legislatures and to Congress. Harlem became a cultural center for writers, musicians, and artists. Within the ghetto existed a world with economic, political, and social opportunities for black men and women that did not exist in the South.

**Economic Expansion.** Despite the turmoil of the period and the dissatisfaction of intellectuals, the 1920s was an exceptionally prosperous era in America. Business boomed, real wages rose, and unemployment declined. Perhaps as much as 40 percent of the world's wealth lay in American hands. Government policy, pent-up demand from the war, and the continuing mechanization and rationalization of industry fueled economic growth. Assembly lines and time and motion engineering helped increase productivity and profits.

**The Age of the Consumer.** Increases in productivity and prosperity brought a new era of consumerism. Producers tailored their goods to meet consumer demand, and the advertising
industry ensured that the demand existed. Consumer durables led the economic surge. The automotive industry in particular exerted a powerful multiplier force on the economy. By 1929, Americans drove some 29 million privately owned automobiles. The car changed family life and recreational patterns. It made a mobile people more mobile and became a symbol of American freedom, prosperity, and individualism.

**Henry Ford.** Henry Ford, the man most responsible for the growth of the automotive industry, was not a great inventor. His genius lay in the areas of production, personnel, and business management techniques. Cost-efficient assembly lines allowed mass production of inexpensive cars. Ford realized that high wages not only ensured retention of his trained work force but also stimulated consumer spending. The Ford Motor Company's "Model T," a low-cost, well-constructed auto, dominated the market for many years. Ford's unwillingness to cater to consumer demand, however, enabled other manufacturers to cut into Ford's share of the market.

**The Airplane.** Internal combustion gasoline engines made motorized flight possible. World War I speeded the advance of airplane technology, and most planes built in the 1920s were intended for military use. In the postwar years, wing walkers, parachutists, and other "barnstormers" expanded the public's fascination with the airplane. Commercial air service developed slowly; the first regularly scheduled passenger and mail service began in 1927. Charles A. "Lucky Lindy" Lindbergh captured the world's imagination with his nonstop New York to Paris flight in May 1927.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The impact of prejudice on the setting of immigration quotas.
2. The impact of the city on family life.
3. Changes in patterns of courtship in the 1920s.
4. Changes in women's role in society.
5. The sources of the fundamentalist reaction.
6. How prohibition reflected and deepened the rifts in American society.
8. Why the intellectuals of the 1920s considered themselves a "lost generation" and how this perception affected their work.
9. The various factors contributing to the emergence of a "New Negro."

10. The basis of economic prosperity in the 1920s.

POUNTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Different groups, such as the medical profession, supporters of eugenics, middle-class women, and social reformers, all had different reasons for supporting birth control. What were their various reasons and how did they differ?

2. Discuss the significance of film and radio in creating a national culture.

3. The decade of the 1920s became the golden age of sports, not simply because of the feats of a handful of superstars, but because of changes in American society. In what ways was urbanization necessary for mass spectator sports? In what ways did the industrial system contribute? In what ways did transportation play a role?

4. Discuss the KKK, fundamentalism, nativism, and the youth culture as part of a process of adjustment to social change.

5. What, if anything, do the stories of the “lady murderesses” (see the Re-Viewing the Past” section) reveal about urban life in the 1920s?

6. The debate over whether the twenties were frivolous or conservative (see the “Debating the Past” section) assumes that the twenties marked a distinct departure from the preceding era. What continuities can one find between the Progressive Era, World War I, and the 1902s?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The growth of a consumer economy had an enormous impact on the daily lives of millions of Americans. Central heating, hot water heaters, preserved foods, ready-to-wear clothing, mass-produced furniture, and electrical appliances changed household routines. Electrical appliances such as irons, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, toasters, and refrigerators revolutionized the household. The growth of services had a similar impact. Sales of canned foods more than doubled between 1914 and 1924. The number of delicatessens grew three times faster than the population. The number of commercial bakeries increased 60 percent.

These changes, coupled with other factors, changed the function of housewives. Smaller homes took less time to care for, and birth control became widely practiced. The birthrate declined 23 percent among white women and 21 percent among non-white women. The resulting smaller families also changed the lives of housewives.
Commercial services and electrical appliances reduced the time it took to perform various household tasks. Consider, for example, what an electric iron replaced. Before the electric iron, one had to heat heavy irons on the stove and use one until it cooled. The cool iron was returned to the stove and the hot one taken from the stove and used until it cooled. The weight of the irons alone made this heavy work. By the end of the 1920s, 90 percent of the homes in Muncie, Indiana, had electric irons. Electric irons did not require using the stove (which meant they eliminated the need to haul coal or wood). Moreover, they weighed a fraction of the irons they replaced.

The vacuum cleaner replaced even heavier labor. Beating the rugs was an arduous task by itself, but one first had to move all the furniture, carry the rugs outside, and hang them. Then, one had to reverse the entire process. The electric ringer washing machines of the 1920s were not much help compared to a fully electric washing machine, but when compared to a scrub board, they were wonderful devices. Electric stoves replaced coal or wood stoves. Wood stoves required chopping and carrying wood; coal stoves required hauling coal in buckets from the basement. Electric refrigerators replaced iceboxes, which needed to be emptied every day.

In short, the electrical appliances shortened the time it took to perform given household chores. Ruth Schwartz Cowan has argued that these appliances did not reduce the time spent on housework. Standards of cleanliness increased. For example, one vacuumed every week; the rugs were beaten twice a year. While this point is well taken, it misses a basic reality. These appliances freed up time. It took all day to beat the rugs; it took far less time to vacuum an apartment or house. If one averaged the time devoted to the respective tasks over a year, the time might be roughly the same, but the distribution was different.

The time and labor involved in, say, preparing dinner in the prewar era greatly exceeded that required in the 1920s. Instead of bringing wood or coal to the stove, a woman simply turned on the range or oven. Commercially baked bread, canned soup, and other prepared food might further reduce the time it took to prepare dinner.

Even if the amount of time saved was marginal, and in many cases it was not, electrical appliances changed the nature of housework by eliminating much of the heavy physical labor. This seemingly simple fact helps explain the fads of the 1920s. Women who beat the rugs or did laundry on a scrub board, made a fire in the wood or coal stove, and then cooked dinner did not head out to play mah-jong in the afternoon or bridge in the evening. They were lucky if they could stand up long enough to get the kids to bed before collapsing themselves.

In short, the function of housewives changed in the 1920s. Women of an earlier era were producers; the housewife of the 1920s was becoming a consumer. The effort and time involved in running a household might not have been reduced (indeed, with the increasing rarity of household help, it may have increased), but the effort was directed differently.

For further reading, see Ruth Schwartz Cowan, More Work for Mother (New York: Basic, 1983); Susan Strasser, Never Done (New York: Pantheon, 1982); and Glenna Matthews, "Just a Housewife" (New York: Oxford, 1987).
INTRODUCTION

Advertising came of age in the 1920s, as America underwent the transformation from a primary industrial society to a consumer society. Unlike food, clothing, and shelter, the goods that drove the economy of the 1920s (automobiles, radios, phonographs, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, sewing machines, home telephones, and electric appliances) were not unquestionable necessities. Thus, advertising had to change its role. Not only did advertisers have to convince a consumer to buy a particular brand of a product, they had to create a demand for that product as well.

Advertisers did so by associating products with the gratification of fundamental human appetites, the most basic of which was sex. Advertising for Listerine mouthwash demonstrated this change. Earlier ads for Listerine promised to "kill germs" and touted the product as a "topical antiseptic." In the twenties, Listerine promised to eliminate "halitosis," a term for bad breath discovered in an obscure British medical journal. A Listerine ad of 1922 told a sad tale:

She was a beautiful girl and talented too. She had the advantages of education and better clothes than most girls of her set. She possessed that culture and poise that travel brings. Yet in one pursuit that stands foremost in the mind of every girl and woman—marriage—she was a failure.

The reason for her "failure" was "halitosis."

Aside from selling sex appeal, advertising used powerful emotions, such as fear and guilt, to sell products. Scott Tissue ran a campaign to warn the public that harsh toilet paper caused irritation that was "not only a source of discomfort but also a possible seat of infection" (not to mention infection of the seat). One ad showed a woman in a hospital bed with concerned friends hovering by her bedside. Another showed a team of surgeons preparing to operate on a victim of harsh toilet paper.

Both documents play on fear and guilt. The first document is an ad for the Berkey & Gay Furniture Company from 1925. The second document is an ad for the Eveready Flashlight and Battery Company from 1927.

Questions for Discussion

1. On what fears particular to the 1920s does the ad for furniture play? What forces drew "young people" out of the house? How likely was a new living room set to counteract those forces? Why might this ad have been effective?

2. Both ads play on the guilt of the consumer. To which parent is the ad for flashlight batteries addressed? Why?
Advertisement for Berkey & Gay Furniture Company (1925)

Do they know Your son at MALUCIO's?

There's a hole in the door at Malucio's. Ring the bell and a pair of eyes will look coldly out at you. If you are known you will get in. Malucio has to be careful.

There have been riotous nights at Malucio's. Tragic nights, too. But somehow the fat little man has managed to avoid the law.

Almost every town has its Malucio's. Some, brightly disguised as cabarets-others, mere back street filling stations for pocket flasks.

But every Malucio will tell you the same thing. His best customers are not the ne'er-do-wells of other years. They are the young people-frequently, the best young people of the town.

Malucio has put one over on the American home. Ultimately he will be driven out. Until then THE HOME MUST BID MORE INTELLIGENTLY FOR MALUCIO'S BUSINESS.

There are many reasons why it is profitable and wise to furnish the home attractively, but one of these, and not the least, is-Malucio's.

The younger generation is sensitive to beauty, princely proud, and will not entertain in homes of which it is secretly ashamed.

But make your rooms attractive, appeal to the vaulting pride of youth, and you may worry that much less about Malucio's-and the other modern frivolities that his name symbolizes.

A guest room smartly and tastefully furnished—a refined and attractive dining room—will more than hold their own against the tinsel cheapness of Malucio's.

Nor is good furniture any longer a luxury for the favored few. THE PRESCOTT suite shown above, for instance, is a moderately priced pattern, conforming in every detail to the finest Berkey & Gay standards.

In style, in the selection of rare and beautiful woods, and in the rich texture of the finish and hand decorating, it reveals the skill of craftsmen long expert in the art of quality furniture making.

The PRESCOTT is typical of values now on display at the store of your local Berkey & Gay dealer. Depend on his showing you furniture in which you may take deep pride—beautiful, well built, luxuriously finished, and moderately priced.

There is a Berkey & Gay pattern suited to every home—an infinite variety of styles at prices ranging all the way from $350 to $6,000.
The Song that STOPPED!

A child of five skipped down the garden path and laughed because the sky was blue. "Jane," called her mother from the kitchen window, "come here and help me bake your birthday cake." Little feet sped. "Don't fall," her mother warned.

Jane stood in the kitchen door and wrinkled her nose in joy. Her gingham dress was luminous against the sun. What a child! Dr. and Mrs. Wentworth cherished Jane.

"Go down to the cellar and get mother some preserves...the kind you like."

"The preserves are in the cellar," she chanted, making a progress twice around the kitchen. "Heigh-ho a-derry-o, the preserves are..." her voice grew fainter as she danced off. "...in the ..."

The thread of song snapped. A soft thud-thud. Fear fluttered Mrs. Wentworth's heart. She rushed to the cellar door.

"Mother!" ...a child screaming in pain. Mrs. Wentworth saw a little morsel of girlhood lying in a heap of gingham and yellow hair at the bottom of the dark stairs.

The sky is still blue. But there will be no birthday party tomorrow. An ambulance clanged up to Dr. Wentworth's house today. Jane's leg is broken.

If a flashlight had been hanging on a hook at the head of the cellar stairs, this little tragedy would have been averted. If Jane had been taught to use a flashlight as carefully as her father, Dr. Wentworth, had taught her to use a tooth-brush, a life need not have been endangered.

An Eveready Flashlight is always a convenience and often a life-saver. Keep one about the house, in the car; and take one with you wherever you go. Keep it supplied with fresh Eveready Batteries—the longest-lasting flashlight batteries made. Eveready Flashlights, $1.00 up.

NATIONAL CARBON CO., INC. EVEREADY FLASHLIGHTS & BATTERIES
A THOUSAND THINGS MAY HAPPEN IN THE DARK
CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Harding and "Normalcy." Harding gained the Republican nomination largely because of his genial nature and lack of strong convictions. Hard working and politically astute, Harding was also indecisive and unwilling to offend. Harding appointed able and reputable men to the major cabinet posts, including Charles Evans Hughes, Herbert Hoover, Andrew Mellon, and Henry C. Wallace. However, many lesser offices, and a few major ones, went to his Ohio cronies.

"The Business of the United States is Business." Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon dominated domestic policy. Mellon sought to lower taxes on the rich, reverse the low-tariff policies of the Wilson period, and reduce the national debt by cutting expenses. His policies had considerable merit, but Mellon carried his policies to an extreme. Mellon's tax and tariff program ran into opposition from the farm bloc, a coalition of mid-western Republicans and southern Democrats. Mellon nevertheless balanced the budget and reduced the national debt by an average of over $500 million a year. The business community heartily approved of the policies of the Harding and Coolidge administrations. Both Harding and Coolidge used appointments to convert regulatory bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Reserve Board, into pro-business agencies that ceased almost entirely to restrict the activities of the industries over which they had control.

The Harding Scandals. Although personally honest, Harding appointed cronies known as the "Ohio Gang" who demonstrated a propensity for corruption. Scandals rocked the Justice Department and the Veterans Bureau. The greatest scandal, however, involved Harding's secretary of the interior, Albert B. Fall. Fall leased naval petroleum reserves to private oil companies. A Senate investigation into the Teapot Dome Scandal revealed that Fall had received over $300,000 in loans from these oil companies. The American people, who had not yet learned the extent of the scandals, genuinely mourned Harding's death.

Coolidge Prosperity. Vice-President Coolidge had no connection with the Harding scandals and cleaned house on taking office. His pro-business philosophy endeared him to conservatives. In 1924, Coolidge easily won the Republican nomination. The badly divided Democrats finally chose a compromise candidate after 103 ballots. In the general election, Coolidge easily defeated the Democratic challenger, John W. Davies. Robert M. La Follette, running on the Progressive party ticket, finished a distant third.

Peace Without a Sword. Disillusion with the results of World War I led Americans to withdraw from foreign involvement, but American economic interests made complete withdrawal impossible. While the United States avoided formal alliances, diplomatic efforts included the Washington Conference (1921), at which leading nations agreed to maintain the
Open Door in China and to limit the costly naval arms race. Three far-reaching treaties were drafted. The Five-Power Treaty limited the number of battleships of its signatories. Countries signing the Four-Power Treaty agreed to respect each other's interests in the Pacific. The Nine-Power Treaty pledged to maintain China's sovereignty and the Open Door. By initiating the Conference, the United States regained some of the moral influence lost when it refused to join the League. However, the treaties were essentially toothless.

**The Peace Movement.** While sincerely desiring peace, Americans refused to surrender any sovereignty or to build an adequate defense. So great was the nation's desire to avoid foreign entanglements that the United States refused to join the World Court. At the same time, peace societies such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Woodrow Wilson Foundation flourished. Many Americans believed that peace could be attained simply by pointing out the moral and practical disadvantages of war. The desire for peace culminated in the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928. Signed by over fifteen nations, the pact renounced "war as an instrument of national policy."

**The Good Neighbor Policy.** Coolidge acted with restraint in the face of continued instability in Mexico, even though Americans with interests in land and oil rights suffered heavy losses. Under Herbert Hoover, American policy began to treat Latin American nations as equals. The Clark Memorandum (1930) disassociated the right of intervention in Latin America from the Roosevelt Corollary. According to Clark, the United States' right to intervene depended on "the doctrine of self-preservation." Franklin Delano Roosevelt continued the Good Neighbor Policy. By 1934, the Marines had withdrawn from Nicaragua, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic; and the United States abrogated the right to intervene in Cuba.

**The Totalitarian Challenge.** The limitations of isolationism became evident in 1931 when Japan occupied Manchuria in violation of both the Nine-Power and the Kellogg-Briand pacts. China appealed to the United States and the League of Nations for aid, but neither would intervene. The United States announced the Stimson Doctrine, which stated that the United States would never recognize the legality of territory seized in violation of American treaty rights. The Stimson Doctrine served only to irritate the Japanese. In January 1932, Japan attacked Shanghai. The League condemned the aggression, and, in response, Japan withdrew from the League.

**War Debts and Reparations.** Quarrels over war debts hindered efforts by the former Allies to deal with Japan's aggression. The United States demanded repayment of loans made to its allies during World War I. The Allies could not repay the loans, and the American protective tariff made it nearly impossible for them to gain the dollars necessary to pay the debts. The Allies added the cost of their debts to German reparation payments. Germany could not pay the huge sums assessed for reparations and was reluctant even to try. Despite the restructuring of reparations under the Dawes (1924) and Young (1929) plans, Germany defaulted on its payments; in turn, France and Britain defaulted on their loans.

**The Election of 1928.** A successful businessman, a technocrat, and a skilled bureaucrat, Herbert Hoover easily won the Republican nomination. He believed that capital and labor
could cooperate to achieve mutually beneficial goals. His opponent, Alfred E. Smith, a New York Democrat, was in many ways Hoover's antithesis. A Catholic antiprohibitionist, Smith represented the urban, immigrant, machine-style politics of the nation's cities. Hoover won a smashing victory.

**Economic Problems.** The prosperity of the 1920s masked serious flaws in the economy. Not all sectors of the economy shared in the prosperity; the coal and cotton industries lagged behind the general economy. The trend toward consolidation of industries continued throughout the period. Voluntary trade associations, with government backing, now practiced self-regulation. The weakest sector of the economy was agriculture. While most economic indicators reflected an unprecedented prosperity, the boom rested on unstable foundations. Maldistribution of resources posed the greatest problem. Productive capacity raced ahead of purchasing power. Large sums of money were invested in speculative ventures rather than in productive enterprises.

**The Stock Market Crash of 1929.** The stock market raced ahead beginning in early 1928. Prices climbed still higher during the first half of 1929. The market wavered in September, but few saw cause for serious concern. On October 29, 1929, the stock market collapsed, and the boom ended.

**Hoover and the Depression.** The stock market collapse was more a symptom of economic woe than the cause of the depression. The Great Depression was a worldwide phenomenon caused primarily by economic imbalances resulting from World War I. In the United States, concentration of wealth, speculative investment, and under-consumption contributed to the severity of the depression. Hoover relied upon voluntarism and mutual self-interest to cure the economic ills. He rejected classical economics and proposed a number of measures to combat the depression. However, he overestimated the willingness of citizens to act in the public interest without legal compulsion and relied too much on voluntary cooperation. Private charities soon ran out of money. As the depression deepened, Hoover placed more emphasis on balancing the budget, which further decreased the supply of money. The Hawley-Smoot Tariff (1930) imposed high rates on manufactured goods, which contracted trade.

**The Economy Hits Bottom.** In the spring of 1932, thousands of Americans faced starvation. People unable to pay rent established shantytowns they called "Hoovervilles." People begged for food while agricultural prices dropped so low that farmers organized Farm Holiday movements. In the summer of 1932, twenty thousand World War I veterans marched on Washington to seek immediate payment of their war bonuses. When Congress rejected their appeal, some refused to leave and established a camp on the Anacostia Flats. Federal troops dispersed the Bonus Army. The unprecedented severity of the depression led some to propose radical economic and political changes.

**The Depression and Its Victims.** The depression had a profound psychological impact on the American people. There were simply no jobs to be found. People who lost jobs at first searched for new ones; after a few months, however, they became apathetic. Economic
stress brought personal stress. Power shifted within families. Family size decreased. Hopelessness and malnutrition contributed to the lack of political radicalism during the depression.

**The Election of 1932.** The Democrats chose Franklin Delano Roosevelt of New York to challenge Hoover in 1932. Roosevelt campaigned on optimism and grand, but unspecified, solutions to the nation's economic woes. Desperate for a change in style and substance, Americans rallied to Roosevelt's promises of a New Deal. He proposed that the government take whatever steps were necessary to protect individual and public interests. Roosevelt won with an electoral margin of 472 to 59. The last days of the Hoover administration and a "lame duck" Congress witnessed the nadir of the depression.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. Harding's approach to the presidency.
2. Mellon's economic policies.
3. The various scandals that beset the Harding administration.
4. The treaty system established by the Washington Conference.
5. The various manifestations of the peace movement in the 1920s.
6. The improvement in relations with Latin America and the barriers to genuinely good relations.
7. The controversy over debts and reparations.
8. The significance of Hoover's victory in 1928.
9. The economic weaknesses underlying the prosperity of the 1920s.
10. Hoover's policies in response to the depression.
11. The social impact of the economic collapse.
12. Roosevelt's campaign strategy in 1932.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Discuss the changing constituency of the Democratic party and the struggle for control between its rival wings.

2. The text asserts that the central economic problem of the 1920s was "maldistribution of resources." That term implies that the authors know what the "proper" distribution of wealth should be. Does this concept provide a basis for an objective analysis? What the authors mean is that wealth was unevenly distributed. During the period from 1900-1915, however, wealth was more unevenly distributed than in the 1920s, and the earlier period was a time of prosperity. What does that mean for an analysis that attributes weakness in the economy to "maldistribution of resources?"

3. To what extent did Hoover's rejection of laissez-faire economics pave the way for Roosevelt and the New Deal?

4. Explain Hoover's failure to deal adequately with the economic crisis.

5. Discuss the impact of the depression on families and on gender relations.

6. Compare the party platforms in 1932. Is there any significant difference between them?

7. The "Mapping the Past" section indicates that Roosevelt won the overwhelming majority of states in 1932. The incumbent, Herbert Hoover, had lost only eight states in winning the presidency in 1928; he won only six in his bid for reelection four years later. Even Ohio, previously a Republican stronghold, and Montana, a state "not commonly associated with FDR's obvious constituency" went for Roosevelt in 1932. In that election, Roosevelt won roughly 22.8 million votes; Hoover received roughly 15.8 million. From where did Hoover’s votes come? ?"

8. Of the various explanations for the Great Depression offered in the “Debating the Past” section, which explanation or combination of explanations seems most convincing?
LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

Looking back, it seems somehow appropriate that Herbert Hoover delivered his inaugural address in a cold, drizzling rain. In spite of the weather, however, his speech radiated hope for the future. In words that ring with irony, he declared, "I have no fears for the future of our country. It is bright with hope."

Hoover was ideally suited to preside over prosperity; indeed, he seemed the perfect choice for president. He was one of the very few individuals of whom it might legitimately be said that he was qualified to be president.

Born to a Quaker family in 1874, Hoover came from an old stock American family. After reaching maturity, Hoover showed no outward sign of his boyhood faith, except for his conservative style of dress. He could swear with the miners he directed; he enjoyed a good drink; and he often fished on Sundays. Yet traits of the Quaker faith remained: morality, a commitment to progress, and idealism. Most important of all, Hoover retained a belief in voluntary cooperation. Quaker meetings arrive at decisions through consensus, because they do not recognize the right of one person to coerce another. Influenced by his Quaker upbringing, Hoover distrusted coercion throughout his life.

After being orphaned at the age of nine, Hoover was shuffled between relatives. In the late 1880s, he went to the Pacific coast to live with an uncle. There he became an office boy for the Oregon Land Company and developed an interest in mining. He graduated from Stanford University's first class and went on to work as a miner and then an engineer. He established his own consulting firm, which took over the operations of ailing firms and ran them for a percentage of the profits. At the age of forty, Hoover was a millionaire.

At the same time, Hoover came to the conclusion that American society would have to reach a compromise between individual advantage and the public interest. His attempts to reconcile individualism and collectivism formed the basis for his political ideology. The means of reconciling the two, he concluded, was voluntary cooperation.

During World War I, Hoover served as director of the Belgian Relief Commission. After the United States entered the war, he became Food Administrator and headed the best-run and most successful of the wartime agencies. After the war, Hoover was in charge of food relief for Europe. In many ways, he was the archetypical progressive. As an engineer, an "expert," he could make society run properly. Hoover served as secretary of commerce under Harding and Coolidge; in doing so, Hoover elevated his department to a major branch of government. His commitment to trade associations reflected his belief in the power of voluntary cooperation.

Hoover made a peculiar politician. He had never run for elective office before running for president. He expressed himself poorly and never became an effective speaker. Moreover, he disliked the ballyhoo of politics. His political success derived from his technical and administrative abilities, not his ability to charm people.

Nevertheless, he won a smashing victory in 1928. The issue of Smith's Catholicism and his ties with Tammany Hall often have obscured the fact that the New Yorker was economically more conservative than Hoover.

The first eight days of Hoover's administration seemed to promise fulfillment of the high expectations people had for him. He terminated further leasing of oil rights on the public domain, took action against corrupt patronage practices, prevented a railroad strike, presented
a plan for a graduated income tax, refused to become involved in red hunting, forced the resignation of Mabel Walker Willebrandt (an assistant attorney general associated with the fanatical enforcement of prohibition), demanded an increase in the budget of Howard University, and ignored racist protests when his wife entertained black women at the White House.

In fact, achievement marked his first eight months in office. Hoover seemed set to preside over one of the most successful administrations in history. The stock market crash dashed all of this.

Hoover responded to the depression by expanding his programs. He did not, however, change his methods. Rather than use the coercive power of the federal government, he relied on persuasion, education, conferences, and fact-finding commissions. As the economic situation worsened, Hoover became the most active leader in American history to that time in dealing with the problem of economic depression. He began to increase federal expenditures. In fact, fiscal stimulation to the economy by the federal government was greater in 1931 than in any other year of the decade except 1934, 1935, and 1936. If one counted the spending of state and local governments, there was more government spending in 1931 than in any other year of the 1930s. In 1932, Roosevelt attacked Hoover for the latter's reckless spending.

Hoover's became the first administration to use the power of the federal government to intervene directly in the economy in peacetime. However, Hoover continued to distrust coercion. All of his efforts depended on voluntary cooperation. This accounted in large part for the failure of the National Credit Corporation. By the end of Hoover's term, voluntarism had failed. For all his efforts, Hoover was constrained by his ideology. He distrusted coercion and feared the threat it posed to individual freedom. By the end of his administration, Hoover had reached the limits of his ideology, and the American public had reached the limit of its patience with Hoover.

The depression did not affect everyone in the same way. Stories of middle-class people losing their homes, wealthy children being pulled from boarding schools, and the working class finding themselves on the streets did not represent the full range of experience of the Great Depression. Many people noticed little change in their daily lives. The very poor continued to live a squalid existence; some middle-class people, particularly those with secure and relatively stable incomes, could afford services once out of their reach.

The documents in this section are taken from Studs Terkel's oral histories of people who had experienced the Great Depression. The first document is a recollection of William Benton, who began the ad agency of Benton & Bowles with his friend Chester Bowles, in 1929. Benton went on to become a United States senator from Connecticut, assistant secretary of state, vice-president of the University of Chicago, and publisher of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Bowles was later governor of Connecticut and American ambassador to India.

The second document is from Terkel's interview with Dr. David J. Rossman, a psychiatrist who had studied with Freud.

The third document is the interview with Clifford Burke, a black man who, when Terkel interviewed him in the 1960s, was living on a pension. During the depression, he worked on and off as a teamster for a lumberyard. He also made money hustling pool. It was a point of pride that he never applied for PWA or WPA.


**Questions for Discussion**

1. What kinds of occupations were likely either to have benefited from the depression or to have maintained their position?

2. To what factors does Benton attribute his firm's success?

3. The psychiatrist and the underemployed black man noticed the least change in their lives. Why?
William Benton, "In all catastrophes, there is the potential of benefit."

I left Chicago in June of ’29, just a few months before the Crash. Chester Bowles and I started in business with seventeen hundred square feet, just the two of us and a couple of girls. July 15, 1929—this was the very day of the all—time peak on the stock market.

As I solicited business, my chart was kind of a cross. The left-hand line started at the top corner and ended in the bottom right-hand corner. That was the stock market index. The other line was Benton & Bowles. It started at the bottom left-hand corner and ended in the top right-hand corner. A cross. As the stock market plummeted into oblivion, Benton & Bowles went up into stardom. When I sold the agency in 1935, it was the single biggest office in the world. And the most profitable office.

My friend, Beardsley Ruml, was advocate of the theory: progress through catastrophe. In all catastrophes, there is the potential of benefit. I benefited out of the Depression. Others did, too. I suppose the people who sold red ink, red pencils, and red crayons benefited.

I was only twenty-nine, and Bowles was only twenty-eight. When things are prosperous, big clients are not likely to listen to young men or to new ideas. In 1929, most of your Wall Street manipulators called it The New Era. They felt it was the start of a perpetual boom that would carry us on and on forever to new plateaus....

Benton & Bowles plunged into radio in a big way for our clients.

We didn't know the Depression was going on. Except that our clients' products were plummeting, and they were willing to talk to us about new ideas. They wouldn't have let us in the door if times were good. So the Depression benefited me. My income doubled every year. When I left Benton & Bowles, it must have been close to half a million dollars. That's the kind of money great motion picture stars weren't earning. That was 1935. The Depression just passed me right over.
David Rossman, "You wouldn't know a Depression was going on."

You wouldn't know a Depression was going on. Except that people were complaining they didn't have jobs. You could get the most wonderful kind of help for a pitance. People would work for next to nothing. That's when people were peddling apples and bread lines were forming all over the city. But on the whole—don't forget the highest unemployment was less than 20 percent?

... My patients paid fairly reasonable fees. I just came across a bankbook that I had between 1931 and 1934, and, by God, I was in those days making $2,000 a month, which was a hell of a lot of money. Then in 1934, 1935, 1936, they began coming in droves, when things began to ease up. People were looking for help. All middle class. Money loosened up. At the outbreak of the war, all psychiatrists in New York were just simply drowned with work. I saw my first patient at seven in the morning and I worked till nine at night.

Clifford Burke, "The Negro was born in depression."

The Negro was born in depression. It didn't mean too much to him. The Great American Depression, as you call it. The best he could be is a janitor or a porter or shoeshine boy. It only became official when it hit the white man. If you can tell me the difference between the depression today and the Depression of 1932 for a black man, I'd like to know it. Now, it's worse, because of the prices. Know the rents they're payin' out here? I hate to tell ya.

We had one big advantage. Our wives, they could go to the store and get a bag of beans or a sack of flour and a piece of fat meat, and they could cook this. And we could eat it. Steak? A steak would kick in my stomach like a mule in a tin stable. Now you take the white fella, he couldn't do this. His wife would tell him: Look, if you can't do any better than this, I'm gonna leave you. I seen it happen. He couldn't stand bringing home beans instead of steak and capon. And he couldn't stand the idea of going on relief like a Negro.

You take a fella had a job paying him $60, and here I am making $25. If I go home taking beans to my wife, we'll eat it. It isn't exactly what we want, but we'll eat it. The white man that's been making big money, he's taking beans home, his wife'll say: Get out. [Laughs.]

Why did these big wheels kill themselves? They weren't able to live up to the standards they were accustomed to, and they got ashamed in front of their women. You see, you can tell anybody a lie, and he'll agree with you. But you start layin' down the facts of real life, he won't accept it. The American white man has been superior so long, he can't figure out why he should come down.

I remember a friend of mine, he didn't know he was a Negro. I mean he acted like he never knew it. He got tied downtown with some stock. He blew about twenty thousand. He came home and drank a bottle of poison. A bottle of iodine or something like that. It was a rarity to hear a Negro killing himself over a financial situation. He might have killed himself over some woman. Or getting in a fight. But when it came to the financial end of it, there were so few who had anything. [Laughs.]
CHAPTER 27
The New Deal: 1933-1941

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The Hundred Days. By the date of Roosevelt's inauguration, the disintegration of the banking system convinced conservatives and radicals alike of the necessity for government intervention. During the first "hundred days" of Roosevelt's presidency, Congress passed an impressive body of legislation. On March 5, 1933, the president declared a "bank holiday." Legislation of the Hundred Days created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), forced the separation of investment and commercial banking, extended the power of the Federal Reserve Board, established the Home Owners Loan Corporation (HOLC), and regulated the securities exchange. Roosevelt had no comprehensive plan of action; rather he employed an ad hoc approach, which sometimes resulted in contradictory policies. Although most measures of the Hundred Days were designed to stimulate the economy, the Economy Act reduced salaries of federal employees and cut veterans' benefits.

The National Recovery Administration (NRA). The problems of unemployment and industrial stagnation received high priority during the Hundred Days. Congress appropriated $500 million for aid to the needy. The newly created Civilian Conservation Corp (CCC) employed tens of thousands of young men. The National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA), a controversial piece of legislation, created the Public Works Administration (PWA), allowed manufacturers to establish price and production limits, established a minimum wage and maximum hours, and guaranteed labor the right to bargain collectively. A variant on the idea of the corporate state, the NIRA envisaged a system of industry-wide organizations of capitalists and workers (supervised by government) that would resolve conflicts internally.

The National Recovery Administration (NRA), created by the NIRA, oversaw the drafting and operation of business codes. The NIRA failed to end the depression. Dominant producers in each industry supervised the drafting and operation of the codes. They used their power to raise prices and limit production rather than to hire more workers and increase output.

Even though the NIRA provided protection for collective bargaining, the conservative and craft-oriented AFL displayed little enthusiasm for enrolling unskilled workers on an industry-wide basis. John Lewis and other labor leaders created an alternative to the AFL by establishing the Congress of Industrial Organizations, formed to organize workers on an industry-wide basis without regard to craft.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA). The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 combined compulsory production limitations with government subsidization of staple farm commodities. In effect, the AAA paid farmers to produce less. While some farmers benefited, others, particularly sharecroppers and tenant farmers, did not.
The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) Act of 1933 created a board authorized to construct dams, power plants, and transmission lines, as well as to market electrical power to individuals and communities. The TVA also provided a "yardstick" for evaluating the rates and efficiency of private power companies. In addition, the TVA engaged in flood control, soil conservation, and reforestation projects. The TVA never became the comprehensive regional planning organization some of its sponsors intended; it did improve the standard of living for many in the valley.

The New Deal Spirit. Roosevelt infused his administration with a much needed wave of optimism. Roosevelt's receptiveness to new ideas and the increased New Deal bureaucracies drew academics and professionals into government service. The New Deal was never a clearly stated ideological movement. It drew heavily on populism, Theodore Roosevelt's New Nationalism, and the Wilsonian tradition. Washington became a battleground for special interests. William Leuchtenberg described the New Deal as "interest-group democracy." The New Deal gave interest groups other than big business a voice in Washington. On the other hand, it slighted the unorganized majority.

The Unemployed. In 1934, at least 9 million Americans were still unemployed, hundreds of thousands of whom were in desperate need. Nevertheless, the Democrats increased their majorities in Congress. Roosevelt's unemployment policies accounted, at least in part, for Democratic successes at the polls. Roosevelt appointed Harry L. Hopkins to head the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) in 1933. Hopkins insisted that the unemployed needed jobs, not handouts. In November 1933, he persuaded Roosevelt to create the Civil Works Administration (CWA). The CWA employed millions on public works projects. The cost of the CWA frightened Roosevelt, who soon abolished it. In 1935, Roosevelt put Hopkins in charge of the new Works Progress Administration (WPA). In spite of these efforts, at no time during the depression did unemployment fall below 10 percent of the total work force. Roosevelt's fear of deficit spending meant that many New Deal measures did not provide sufficient stimulus to the economy.


Three Extremists: Long, Coughlin, and Townsend. Roosevelt's moderation provoked extremists on both the left and right. The most formidable was the "Kingfish," Huey Long, a senator from Louisiana. Although he never challenged white supremacy, the plight of all poor people concerned him. After initially supporting Roosevelt, Long split from the administration and introduced his "Share Our Wealth" plan, intended to redistribute the
nation's wealth. Less powerful than Long, but more widely influential, was Father Charles E. Coughlin, the "Radio Priest." Coughlin urged currency inflation and attacked the alleged sympathy for communists and Jews within Roosevelt's administration. Coughlin's program resembled fascism more than anything else. Dr. Francis E. Townsend proposed "old-age revolving pensions," which would give $200 per month to the nation's elderly on the conditions that they not hold jobs and that they spend the money within thirty days. The collective threat of these radical reformers forced FDR to adopt a bolder approach toward solving the problems of the depression.

**The Second New Deal.** Despite Roosevelt's efforts, the depression continued unabated. In the spring of 1935, he launched the Second New Deal. The Wagner Act (1935) ensured the right of labor to collective bargaining and prohibited employers from interfering with union organizational activities. The Social Security Act (1935) established a federal system of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance. The Rural Electric Administration (REA) brought electric power to rural areas. The Wealth Tax (1935) raised taxes on large incomes, estates, and gifts. Critics worried that the New Deal restricted liberty. The cost also alarmed them.

By 1936, some members of the administration had fallen under the influence of John Maynard Keynes, who advocated deficit spending to stimulate consumption. Roosevelt never accepted Keynes's theories, but the imperatives of the depression forced him to increase spending beyond the government's income.

**The Election of 1936.** The election of 1936 matched Governor Alfred M. Landon of Kansas and Roosevelt. Although Landon represented the moderate wing of the Republican party, his campaign was hampered by the reactionary views of some of his supporters. Congressman William Lemke of North Dakota ran on the Union party ticket, a coalition of extremist groups. Roosevelt won easily, carrying every state except Maine and Vermont. Democrats also made large gains in city and state elections.

**Roosevelt Tries to Undermine the Supreme Court.** The conservative majority in the Supreme Court declared several major New Deal programs unconstitutional. By 1937, all of the major measures of the Second New Deal appeared doomed. Roosevelt responded by announcing a proposal to increase the number of sitting justices, a thinly disguised attempt to stack the Court with his own appointees. Roosevelt severely misjudged the opposition to the plan. Congress and the public strenuously objected to his tampering with the system of checks and balances. The president eventually yielded to pressure and withdrew his plan. Alarmed by the attack on the Court, two justices changed their positions and voted to uphold New Deal legislation. Moreover, death and retirement created enough vacancies on the Court to allow Roosevelt to appoint a large pro-New Deal majority. Nevertheless, Roosevelt's personal and political prestige suffered from the affair.

**The New Deal Winds Down.** The Court battle marked the beginning of the end of the New Deal. A series of bitter strikes, starting in 1937, alarmed the public. In June 1937, FDR responded to a moderate increase in economic conditions by curtailing government expenditures. The resulting "Roosevelt Recession" included a downturn in the stock market,
rising unemployment, and declining industrial output. In response, Roosevelt finally committed himself to heavy deficit spending, beginning in April 1938. At his urging, Congress passed a $3.75 billion public works bill, new AAA programs, and the Fair Labor Standards Act. These measures did little to ease the recession and alienated conservatives. Particularly after the elections in 1938, a coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats gained enough power to halt expansion of New Deal reforms.

**Significance of the New Deal.** The outbreak of World War II ended the depression. The New Deal ameliorated suffering but failed to revive the economy. Roosevelt's willingness to try different approaches made sense because no one knew what to do. However, his vacillating policies and his desire to maintain a balanced budget often proved counterproductive. As a result of the New Deal, the nation began to look to the government as the guarantor of its public welfare. Roosevelt expanded the federal bureaucracy and increased the power of the presidency. Federal bureaucracies now regulated formerly private sectors. If the New Deal failed to end the depression, the changes it effected altered American life and society.

**Women as New Dealers: The Network.** Largely because of the influence of Eleanor Roosevelt and Molly Dewson, head of the Women's Division of the Democratic National Committee, the Roosevelt administration employed more women in positions of importance than earlier administrations. Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins became the first woman to hold a cabinet post. Molly Dewson and Eleanor Roosevelt headed an informal, yet effective, "network" of influential women whose goal was the placement of reform-minded women in government. Eleanor Roosevelt exerted significant influence, particularly on behalf of civil rights.

**Blacks During the New Deal.** While minimal in 1932, the shift of black voters from the Republican to the Democratic party became overwhelming by 1936. However, Roosevelt remained unwilling to alienate southern members of Congress and deferred to them on racial matters. New Deal programs often treated blacks as second-class citizens. In 1939, black unemployment was twice that of whites, and wages paid to whites were double those received by blacks. Despite this situation, an informal "Black Cabinet," including Mary McLeod Bethune and Charles Forman, lobbied the federal government on behalf of better opportunities for blacks. In the labor movement, the new CIO recruited black members. Thus, while black Americans suffered during the depression, the New Deal brought some relief and a measure of hope.

**A New Deal for Indians.** The New Deal built on earlier policies toward Native Americans. While retaining many paternalistic and ethnocentric attitudes, government policies improved after the appointment of John Collier as Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1933. Under Collier, the government expressed a willingness to preserve traditional Indian cultures. At the same time, it attempted to improve economic and living conditions. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 allowed a degree of autonomy by attempting to reestablish tribal governments and tribal ownership of Indian lands. Some critics, including many Indians, charged Collier with trying to turn back the clock. Others attacked him as a segregationist.
Not all Indians, moreover, particularly those who owned profitable allotments, were willing to yield their privately held land to a tribal corporation.

The Role of Roosevelt. How much credit for New Deal policies belongs to Roosevelt is debatable. Roosevelt left most details and some broad principles to his subordinates. His knowledge of economics was skimpy, and his understanding of many social problems remained superficial. Nevertheless, Roosevelt's personality marked every aspect of the New Deal. His ability to build and manipulate coalitions made the program possible. He personified the government and made citizens believe that the president cared about the condition of ordinary Americans.

The Triumph of Isolationism. Although an internationalist at heart, Roosevelt, like other world leaders, placed the economic recovery of his own nation ahead of global recovery. Isolationist sentiment in America intensified during the 1930s. Senator Gerald P. Nye headed an investigation (1934-1936), the findings of which convinced millions of Americans that financiers and munitions makers had been responsible for America's entry into World War I. Congress passed a series of neutrality acts, which severely restricted the options available to the White House and State Department. In part because of domestic problems and in part because of his own vacillation, Roosevelt seemed to lose control over foreign policy.

War Again in Europe. The aggression of Japan, Italy, and Germany convinced Roosevelt of the need to resist aggression. Fear of isolationist sentiment, however, led Roosevelt to move cautiously and to be less than candid in his public statements. The invasion of Poland and subsequent declarations of war by Great Britain and France budged Congress to adopt cash and carry legislation. In the fall of 1939, Roosevelt sold arms to Britain and France, although he lacked legal authority to do so. Roosevelt also approved a secret program to build an atomic bomb. When Britain ran out of money in 1940, Roosevelt swapped destroyers for British naval bases. In September 1940, Congress established the nation's first peacetime draft.

A Third Term for FDR. Roosevelt ran for an unprecedented third term in the presidential election of 1940. Partisan politics and his belief that only he could control the isolationists undoubtedly played a role in Roosevelt's decision to seek reelection. Wendell L. Willkie, a moderate from Indiana, headed the Republican ticket. Since he supported the basic structure of the New Deal, Willkie focused on opposing the trend of Roosevelt's foreign policies. While rejecting isolationism, Willkie accused Roosevelt of intending to take the United States to war. Roosevelt won the election handily.

The Undeclared War. Roosevelt's victory encouraged him to expand aid to Great Britain. In March 1941, Congress approved the Lend-Lease Act. The American navy began to patrol the North Atlantic and to pass intelligence data to the British navy. In April 1941, the United States occupied Greenland; in July it occupied Iceland. After the Greer incident and the sinking of the Reuben James, the United States had, for all practical purposes, although not officially, gone to war.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The legislation of Roosevelt's "Hundred Days."

2. The impact of the New Deal on organized labor.

3. The ideological roots of the New Deal.

4. The various New Deal relief programs.

5. How the depression affected American literature.

6. The politics of the extreme left and right in the 1930s.

7. The Second New Deal.

8. The reasons for Roosevelt's lopsided victory in 1936.

9. Why Roosevelt's plan to pack the Supreme Court failed.

10. Factors leading to the effective end of the New Deal.

11. The role of women in the New Deal.

12. The legacy of the New Deal.

13. The positive and negative effects of the New Deal on blacks, Native Americans, and Hispanics.

14. The role and significance of Roosevelt in the New Deal.

15. The origins and implications of isolationist foreign policy.

16. Roosevelt's drift from neutrality.

17. The steps by which the United States moved closer to involvement in the Second World War.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Hoover excoriated the New Deal as crypto-fascism, a charge that seems farfetched today. Was the charge as utterly fantastic when Hoover made it? What similarities might one have seen between the New Deal and Mussolini's experiment in Italy?

2. Discuss the concept of "interest-group democracy." Defenders of "interest-group democracy," or the "broker state," point out that new groups gained access and influence. Critics counter that only organized groups gained such access; many remained excluded. What specific groups did not organize and gain favors from the government in the 1930s? In practice, do all groups have an equal opportunity to organize?

3. American writers, so alienated from society in the 1920s, became highly engaged in the 1930s. The change could be seen not only in writers as a group, but in individuals such as Ernest Hemingway and John Dos Passos. What produced this change? What impact did it have on their writing?

4. The text proposes that there were two New Deals. Does this construct adequately describe and analyze the evolution of the New Deal? Roosevelt turned to antitrust in 1937-1938, after the economy turned down severely. Might that be described as a third New Deal? More important, given Roosevelt's lack of ideological commitment and bent toward experimentation, does the construct of two, or even three, New Deals presuppose too much ideological coherence at any given point?

5. The text asserts that Roosevelt was "at heart an internationalist." Many historians disagree; Robert A. Divine, in Roosevelt and World War II, for example, argues that Roosevelt was a sincere isolationist. What evidence supports that position? Which argument is more convincing?

6. Analyze how changing political circumstances relate to the changing interpretations (see the Debating the Past” section) of the New Deal.

7. Contrary to the argument presented in the “Mapping the Past” section, some historians maintain that Roosevelt always overestimated isolationist sentiment. Part of the problem for Roosevelt was that isolationism was particularly strong among key elements of his coalition. Compare this map with that in the “Mapping the Past” section in Chapter 26. What conclusions can you draw?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

As the decade of the thirties wound down, millions gathered to see the World's Fair in New York. Built on a marshy dumping ground in Queens called Flushing Meadows (Scott Fitzgerald called it "a valley of ashes" in The Great Gatsby), the World's Fair opened in 1939. In spite of a decade of unrelenting depression and the threat of war in Europe, the Fair exuded
optimism. Its theme was "Building the World of Tomorrow," and the Fair presented a glorious vision of a streamlined future. The attractions included exhibits from sixty countries, thirty-three states, and major industries. The exhibits, and the Fair itself, held out hope of overcoming the depression, fascism, and a host of other problems facing Americans of the day. Science would provide the answers. The Fair presented a vision of social harmony, unity, prosperity, interdependence, and cooperation.

The principal structures, and principal symbols, of the Fair, the Trylon and Perisphere, dominated the landscape. The Trylon was a tall, thin pyramid. The Perisphere, a huge globe, contained Democracity, a diorama of a planned community in the year 2039. Visitors got on an escalator that took them to one of two rotating balconies overlooking the diorama. From their balconies, viewers could see Centerton (the business and cultural hub), Pleasantvilles (residential suburbs), and Millvilles (light industrial areas). Large greenbelt areas, consisting of agricultural areas and recreational parks, connected the various areas of Democracity.

The exhibits put on by American businesses celebrated mass consumer society. The Consolidated Edison Company displayed the high standard of living achieved by its employees. It did so through an archetypical employee, Bill Jones, who, the exhibit pointed out, earned one-sixth more money for a shorter week than in 1929. Other successful exhibits included A.T.&T., Westinghouse, and General Motors. The General Motors Futurama gave visitors a vision of an America on wheels in 1960. The exhibit featured a highway system with seven-lane superhighways, which permitted speeds of up to a hundred miles an hour. On and off ramps would enable motorists to make "left or right turns at speeds of up to fifty miles an hour." The Westinghouse exhibit included a seven-foot "motoman" (robot) named Elektro and a world of electric living, including a modern kitchen with an automatic dishwasher. Tourists were treated to a "contest" between a woman doing dishes by hand ("Mrs. Drudge") and another woman ("Mrs. Modern") using the wonderful new machine.

Architectural innovations included streamlining, an industrial design inspired by aerodynamics that featured rounded contours and smooth surfaces. Buildings at the Fair made extensive use of Lucite and Plexiglass. Fluorescent interior lighting and air conditioning gave visitors a glimpse of the immediate future. Visitors also had a chance to see television work.

Off to the side, the Fair offered an amusement park covering 280 acres, which contained the sort of thing one might expect to find on the midway at any state fair. The amusements seemed to embarrass the designers of the Fair. It was not granted the status of one of the Fair's seven thematic zones. Among the rides, Life Savers sponsored a parachute jump. An aquacade included swimming stars such as Buster Crabbe, Johnny Weissmuller, and Eleanor Holm. People could jitterbug to swing bands. This section offered some fairly tacky entertainment, including some exhibits that were only a pretentious cut above the peep shows at county fairs.

For all its wonders, the World's Fair was an economic failure. Its organizers kept it open an additional year in an effort to recoup some losses, but the Fair never made money.

Looking back, it is easy to ridicule the naive optimism and pretensions of the Fair. However, by the time Flushing Meadows hosted the World's Fair in 1964, technology and prosperity (if not social harmony) had, in many ways, far exceeded the predictions of 1939.
DOCUMENTS

Introduction

Among the political extremists of the 1930s, Huey Long and Father Charles E. Coughlin stood out. Long represented the left; Coughlin the right.

The first document is from Coughlin's speech titled "A Third Party," given in 1936. The speech advocated support of the Union party, a coalition of Townsendites, Coughlinites, and the remnants of Huey Long's movement.

The second document comes from a circular addressed "To Members and Well-Wishers of the Share Our Wealth Society." Long placed it in the Congressional Record in 1935.


Questions for Discussion

1. How does Coughlin feel about banks? How would he change the banking system? How does his approach differ from Roosevelt's? What does he think about Roosevelt's banking legislation?

2. How does Long propose to "share our wealth"? What is the difference between his proposals and Roosevelt's "soak the rich" tax?

3. Of what New Deal program in particular is Long critical?

4. Given the events of the early 1930s, what in particular about the proposals Coughlin and Long put forward would appeal to their listeners?
By 1932 a new era of production had come into full bloom. It was represented by the motor car, the tractor and power lathe, which enables the laborer to produce wealth ten times more rapidly than was possible for his ancestors. Within the short expanse of 150 years the problem of production had been solved, due to the ingenuity of men like Arkwright and his loom, Fulton and his steam engine, and Edison and his dynamo. These and a thousand other benefactors of mankind made it possible for the teeming millions of people throughout the world to transfer speedily the raw materials into the thousand necessities and conveniences which fall under the common name of wealth.

Thus, with the advent of our scientific era, with its far-flung fields, its spacious factories, its humming motors, its thundering locomotives, its highly trained mechanics, it is inconceivable how such a thing as a so-called depression should blight the lives of an entire nation when there was a plenitude of everything surrounding us, only to be withheld from us because the so-called leaders of high finance persisted in clinging to an outworn theory of privately issued money, the medium through which wealth is distributed.

I challenged this private control and creation of money because it was alien to our Constitution, which says "Congress shall have the right to coin and regulate the value of money." I challenged this system of permitting a small group of private citizens to create money and credit out of nothing, to issue it into circulation through loans and to demand that borrowers repay them with money which represented real goods, real labor and real service. I advocated that it be replaced by the American system—namely, that the creation and control of money and credit are the rights of the people through their democratic government....

No man in modern times received such plaudits from the poor as did Franklin Roosevelt when he promised to drive the money changers from the temple—the money changers who had clipped the coins of wages, who had manufactured spurious money and who had brought proud America to her knees.

March 4, 1933! I shall never forget the inaugural address, which seemed to re-echo the very words of Christ Himself as He actually drove the money changers from the temple.

The thrill that was mine was yours. Through dim clouds of the depression this man Roosevelt was, as it were, a new savior of his people!...

Such were our hopes in the springtime of 1933.

My friends, what have we witnessed as the finger of time turned the pages of the calendar? Nineteen hundred and thirty-three and the National Recovery Act which multiplied profits for the monopolists; 1934 and the AAA which raised the price of foodstuffs by throwing back God's best gifts into His face; 1935 and the Banking Act which rewarded the exploiters of the poor, the Federal Reserve bankers and their associates, by handing over to them the temple from which they were to have been cast!...

Alas! The temple still remains the private property of the money changers. The golden key has been handed over to them for safekeeping—the key which now is fashioned in the shape of a double cross.
Huey Long, "Share Our Wealth" (1935)

Here is the whole sum and substance of the Share Our Wealth movement:

1. Every family to be furnished by the government a homestead allowance, free of debt, of not less than one-third the average family wealth of the country, which means, at the lowest, that every family shall have the reasonable comforts of life up to a value of from $5,000 to $6,000: No person to have a fortune of more than 100 to 300 times the average family fortune, which means that the limit to fortune is between $1,500,000 and $5,000,000, with annual capital levy taxes imposed on all above $1,000,000.

2. The yearly income of every family shall be not less than one-third of the average family income, which means that, according to the estimates of the statisticians of the U. S. Government and Wall Street, no family's annual income would be less than from $2,000 to $2,500: No yearly income shall be allowed to any person larger than from 100 to 300 times the size of the average family income, which means that no person would be allowed to earn in any year more than from $600,000 to $1,800,000, all to be subject to present income tax laws.

3. To limit or regulate the hours of work to such an extent as to prevent over-production; the most modern and efficient machinery would be encouraged so that as much would be produced as possible so as to satisfy all demands of the people, but also to allow the maximum time to the workers for recreation, convenience, education, and luxuries of life.

4. An old age pension to the persons over 60.

5. To balance agricultural production with what can be consumed according to the laws of God, which includes the preserving and storing of surplus commodities to be paid for and held by the Government for emergencies when such are needed. Please bear in mind, however, that when the people of America have had money to buy things they needed, we have never had a surplus of any commodity. This plan of God does not call for destroying any of the things raised to eat or wear, nor does it countenance whole destruction of hogs, cattle or milk.

6. To pay the veterans of our wars what we owe them and to care for their disabled.

7. Education and training for all children to be equal in opportunity in all schools, colleges, universities and other institutions for training in the professions and vocations of life; to be regulated on the capacity of children to learn, and not on the ability of parents to pay the costs. Training for life's work to be as much universal and thorough for all walks in life as has been the training in the arts of killing.

8. The raising of revenues and taxes for the support of this program to come from the reduction of swollen fortunes from the top, as well as for the support of public works to give employment whenever there may be any slackening necessary in private enterprise.
CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The Road to Pearl Harbor. Relations between Japan and the United States deteriorated after Japan resumed its war against China in 1937. Neither the United States nor Japan desired war. Roosevelt considered Nazi Germany to be a more dangerous enemy and dreaded the prospect of a two-front war. In the spring of 1941, Secretary of State Cordell Hull demanded that Japan withdraw from China and pledge not to occupy French and Dutch possessions in Asia. Even moderates in Japan did not accept Hull's demand for total withdrawal. In July 1941, the United States retaliated against Japan's occupation of Indochina by freezing Japanese assets in America and placing an embargo on petroleum. Militarists assumed control of Japan's government, and while the pretense of negotiation continued, Japan prepared to implement war plans against the United States. On December 7, 1941, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. Congress declared war on Japan the following day, and on December 11, the Axis powers declared war on the United States.

Mobilizing the Home Front. Congress granted wide emergency powers to the president. However, Democratic majorities were slim in both houses, and a coalition of conservatives from both parties limited Roosevelt's freedom to act through fiscal oversight. Roosevelt was an inspiring wartime leader but a poor administrator. Nevertheless, Roosevelt's basic decisions made sense. They included financing the war through taxes, basing taxation on ability to pay, rationing scarce resources and consumer goods, and regulating wages and prices. A lack of centralized authority impeded mobilization, but production expanded dramatically. Manufacturing nearly doubled; agricultural output rose 22 percent. Unemployment virtually disappeared. Productive capacity and per capita output increased especially dramatically in the South.

The War Economy. Roosevelt selected James F. Byrnes as his wartime "economic czar." Byrnes headed the Office of War Mobilization, which controlled production, consumption, priorities, and prices. The National War Labor Board arbitrated disputes and stabilized wages. Despite rationing and wage regulations, American civilians experienced no real hardships during the war. Prosperity and stiffer government controls strengthened organized labor; the war did more to institutionalize collective bargaining than the New Deal had done. The war also effected a redistribution of wealth in America. The wealthiest 1 percent of the population received 13.4 percent of the national income in 1935; by 1944 this group received 6.7 percent. The income tax was extended until nearly all Americans paid. Congress adopted the payroll-deduction system to ensure its collection.

War and Social Change. Americans became more mobile. Not only were those in the military moved to training camps all over the United States and to Europe and the Pacific, but
wartime industries drew millions of civilians to new areas. Wartime prosperity allowed new marriages and a higher birthrate.

**Minorities in Time of War: Blacks, Hispanics, and Indians.** Several factors improved the condition of black Americans. Hitler's racial doctrines made racism less respectable. Black leaders pointed out the inconsistency between fighting for democracy abroad and ignoring it at home. Blacks serving in the military were treated more fairly than in World War I; however, the armed forces remained segregated. Economic realities worked to the advantage of black civilians. Unemployment had affected blacks disproportionately; the labor shortage brought full employment. Moreover, defense jobs often involved opportunities to develop valuable skills, opportunities that racist policies of unions and employers had denied to blacks before the war. Blacks moved to the cities of the North, Midwest, and West Coast. Although most migrants had to live in urban ghettos, their very concentration (and the fact that blacks outside the South could vote) gave them greater political clout. The NAACP grew in membership and influence; it also assumed a more activist role. To head off a threatened march on Washington, the president agreed to issue an order prohibiting discrimination in plants with defense contracts. Racial tensions resulted in race riots, the worst of which took place in Detroit. Increased demands for labor led to a reversal of the government's policy of forcing Mexicans out of the Southwest. In Los Angeles, prejudice against Hispanics erupted into rioting against young men wearing zoot suits. Military service and mobility in search of employment increased the American Indian's assimilation into white society.

**The Treatment of German and Italian Americans.** World War II produced less intolerance and repression than World War I. In marked contrast to the First World War, Americans in World War II were generally able to distinguish between the enemy in Italy and Germany and Italian-Americans and German-Americans. Few Italian-Americans supported Mussolini, and most German-Americans were vehemently anti-fascist. Moreover, both groups were well organized and prepared to use their political influence.

**Internment of the Japanese.** In marked contrast to the treatment of Americans of Italian or German descent, 112,000 Japanese-Americans, many of them native-born citizens, were relocated into internment camps. The government feared their potential disloyalty, and the public was aroused by racial prejudice and the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. The Supreme Court upheld restrictions on Japanese-Americans in *Hirabayashi v. U.S.* (1943). Finally, in *Ex Parte Endo* (1944), the Supreme Court forbade the internment of loyal Japanese-American citizens.

**Women's Contribution to the War Effort.** Millions of women entered the work force during the war, and more married women than ever worked outside of the home. Despite initial reluctance by employers and unions, women made inroads into traditionally male domains. Black women bore a double burden of race and gender, but the demand for labor created opportunities for them. In addition to prejudice in the workplace, working women faced housework as well. The war also affected women who did not take jobs. Wartime mobility caused problems for the women who faced new, sometimes difficult, surroundings without traditional support networks. War brides often followed their husbands to training camps,
where they faced problems comparable to those of women who moved to work in defense industries; in addition, they faced the fear and emotional uncertainties of newlyweds, compounded by separation from husbands who were risking their lives overseas.

**Allied Strategy: Europe First.** Allied strategists decided to concentrate on the European war first. The Japanese threat was remote, but Hitler threatened to knock the Soviet Union out of the war. The United States and Soviet Union wanted to establish a second front in France as soon as possible. Churchill pressed instead for strategic bombing raids on German cities and an invasion of German-held North Africa. Churchill got his way. In 1942, Allied planes began to bomb German cities, and an Allied force under Dwight Eisenhower invaded North Africa. The decision to offer conditional surrender terms to the French collaborationist, Admiral Jean Darlan, disturbed Charles de Gaulle and many Americans, but it did yield strategic dividends. Rommel's Afrika Korps surrendered in May 1943. By the fall of 1943, the Soviets had checked the Nazi advance at Stalingrad, and the Allies were pushing their way up the Italian peninsula.

**Germany Overwhelmed.** On D-Day, June 6, 1944, the Allied forces launched a massive attack on the Normandy coast. In the East, millions of Soviet troops slowly pushed back the Axis lines. While Eisenhower prepared for a general advance, the Germans launched a counterattack. The Allies turned back the Germans at the Battle of the Bulge, which cost the Germans their last reserves. On May 8, 1945, Nazi Germany unconditionally surrendered. As the Allies advanced, the horror of the Nazi death camps unfolded. News of the camps had reached the United States much earlier. Yet Roosevelt declined to take any action to save refugees or even to bomb the camps or the rail lines leading to the camps.

**The Naval War in the Pacific.** While the first priority was to defeat Germany, American forces in the Pacific fought to prevent further Japanese expansion. In spite of heavy losses, the American navy turned back a Japanese convoy at the Battle of the Coral Sea (1942). At Midway, the United States fleet decisively defeated a Japanese armada. Thereafter, the initiative in the Pacific shifted to the Americans.

**Island Hopping.** American forces ejected the Japanese from the Solomon Islands in a series of battles around Guadalcanal in which American air power proved decisive. American forces advanced steadily, and by mid-1944, American land-based bombers were within range of Tokyo. In February 1945, MacArthur liberated the Philippines. Two battles in Philippine waters (1944) completed the destruction of Japan's sea power and reduced its air power to kamikazes. American forces took Iwo Jima and Okinawa, only a few hundred miles from the Japanese mainland, in March 1945. The tenacity of Japanese soldiers made it seem that the actual invasion and conquest of Japan would take at least another year and cost an additional million American casualties.

**Building the Atom Bomb.** Following Roosevelt's death in April 1945, Harry S. Truman became America's president. America's scientific community delivered a powerful new weapon, the atom bomb, to Truman. The United States had devoted over six years and $2 billion to develop this weapon. After the first successful test on July 16, 1945, Truman faced
a difficult decision. He could authorize bombing the Japanese cities with this weapon, or he could finish the war using conventional means. The motives behind Truman's decision are still debated. On August 6 and 9, 1945, atomic weapons devastated the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Truman's decision was influenced by the potential casualties involved in an invasion of Japan as well as a desire to end the war before the Soviet Union could intervene effectively and claim a role in making peace. Hatred of Japan undoubtedly also influenced the decision. On August 15, Japan surrendered unconditionally, and the Second World War ended. Millions of people perished in the war, and many areas lay in ruins. Despite the war's horrible cost, improvements in technology and medicine held out the promise of a better world. Scientists argued that the power of the atom could also serve peaceful needs. With the drafting of the United Nations charter in 1945, the world hoped for international cooperation.

Wartime Diplomacy. Hopes of world peace and harmony failed to materialize, largely because of a split between the Soviet Union and the western allies. During the war, American propaganda spared no effort to persuade Americans that the Soviet Union was a devoted, peace-loving ally. Joseph Stalin was portrayed as a kindly father figure. Americans representing viewpoints as diverse as Douglas A. MacArthur and Henry A. Wallace adopted pro-Soviet positions. Such views were naive at best, but the war created an identity of interest in defeating a common enemy. Moreover, the Soviets expressed a willingness to cooperate in resolving postwar problems, and the Soviet Union was one of the original signers of the Declaration of the United Nations. In May 1943, the Soviets dissolved the Comintern. In October, the "big three powers" established the European Advisory Commission to set policy for the occupation of Germany. The Big Three met and cooperated constructively at Teheran and Yalta. At San Francisco, the Allies created a United Nations Organization consisting of a General Assembly (made up of all member nations) and a Security Council (consisting of five permanent members and six other, temporary members).

Allied Suspicion of Stalin. Long before the war ended, the Allies clashed over important issues. Stalin deeply resented the delay in opening a second front. At the same time, the Soviet leader never concealed his determination to protect his western frontier by exerting control over Eastern Europe. Most Allied leaders conceded Stalin's dominance in Eastern Europe, but they never publicly acknowledged this. Conflicts between western commitments to self-determination and Soviet desires for security presented difficult problems, particularly in Poland.

Yalta and Potsdam. At Yalta, Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to Soviet annexation of large sections of eastern Poland. Stalin agreed to allow the Poles to hold free elections, a commitment he probably never intended to keep. A pro-Soviet regime was installed in Poland. The new president, Truman, met with Stalin and the British leadership at Potsdam in July 1945. Potsdam formalized the occupation of Germany. Fortified by news of the successful testing of an atomic bomb, Truman made no concessions to the Soviets. Stalin refused to relinquish his hold on Eastern Europe. Suspicions mounted and positions hardened on both sides. The end of World War II marked the beginning of a new international order dominated by the Soviet-American rivalry.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. Events leading to the war with Japan.

2. The effect of World War II on the American economy.

3. The impact of World War II on ethnic and racial minorities.

4. Why the Japanese-Americans were interned.

5. The changes experienced by women during the war.

6. The reasons for the decision to concentrate on the defeat of Germany first.


8. The controversy surrounding Truman's decision to use the atomic bomb.


POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Explain how the changes experienced by American women during World War II were likely to change American society after the war.

2. Why were American citizens so unprepared for the conflict that emerged between the United States and the Soviet Union?

3. What long-term trends in American society were accelerated by the war? What impact were these changes likely to have on the future?

4. Why were the Japanese Americans interned? In what ways was their situation different from that of Italian and German Americans? To what extent could this be seen as a demonstration of "interest group democracy" in action?

1. The discussion of the movie Saving Private Ryan (in the "Re-Viewing the Past" section) does not deal with what might have motivated men to endure hardships, brave dangers, and demonstrate "a willingness to give up their lives." The only mention of religion in the essay is an ironic reference to a sniper "intoning old Testament verses" while taking "aim at unsuspecting enemies." However, Stephen Ambrose's Citizen Soldiers opens
with a tale of the heroism of Lt. Waverly Wray, whom Ambrose describes as imbued with "Deep South religious convictions." To what extent did religion, patriotism, and notions of democracy motivate "the greatest generation"? To what extent were soldiers simply trying to stay alive or to protect themselves and their buddies?

2. One way of testing John Dower’s contention that the decision to use atomic weapons against Japan derived from “sheer visceral hatred” of the Japanese (see the “Debating the Past” section) is to ask whether the U.S. would have used the weapon against Germany, had it been available before Germany surrendered. What evidence supports the contention that the U.S. would have used the atomic bomb against Germany had it been available? How might one make a case that the U.S. would not have used the weapon against Germany?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

A major concern of American Jews during the Second World War was the rescue of their fellow Jews in Nazi-controlled Europe. America's disgraceful neglect of Hitler's victims resulted from a complex set of circumstances. American Jewish organizations bickered among themselves and were therefore less effective than they might have been. Some Jews feared an outburst of anti-Semitism if large numbers of European Jews were admitted. Their fears were not unreasonable; Father Coughlin and other demagogues had found a large following for anti-Semitic rantings. The single most important factor, however, was the persistence of anti-Semitic attitudes in American society and particularly within the Roosevelt administration.

Fighting a war against Nazi anti-Semitism did not end the existence of discrimination in the United States. Thirty percent of the want ads in the New York Times and Herald Tribune expressed a preference for Protestant or Catholic workers. Some government committees openly discriminated against Jews. Wealthy suburban areas like Darien, Connecticut, and Kensington, Maryland, maintained restrictions against Jews. Elite universities limited the number of Jewish students with a rigid quota system. Polls showed the persistence of anti-Semitic attitudes among the American public.

Admitting refugees to the United States was complicated by immigration restrictions set in 1924, which reflected the anti-Semitism of that xenophobic era. Throughout the war, however, Congress refused to amend the quota. Within the restrictions imposed by law, the administration interpreted the quotas in such a way as to keep to a minimum the number of immigrants admitted. Most striking of all, not one year during the Holocaust did the United States fill the quotas for European Jews, low as those quotas were. The United States admitted only 10 percent of the number of Jews who legally could have been admitted during the years that this country was at war with Germany.

The person in charge of the issue in the State Department was Breckinridge Long, an assistant secretary of state and a vicious anti-Semite. Cordell Hull, the secretary of state, also held strong anti-Semitic feelings. In 1939, Hitler offered to allow a number of German Jewish doctors to leave Germany, provided another country would take them. At a time when many
areas of the South in particular desperately needed doctors, the United States refused to admit these Jewish physicians.

Roosevelt's defenders have argued that the president wanted to win the war first and above all else. Some have even contended, as did Roosevelt, that winning the war as quickly as possible was the best way to save the most Jews. That argument may have applied to the controversy over bombing the camps and the rail lines leading to the camps, but it was absolutely irrelevant to immigration policy.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau's staff prepared a fully documented study, "Report to the Secretary on the Acquiescence of This Government in the Murder of the Jews," which revealed that the State Department knew of Hitler's "final solution" early on and suppressed evidence of it. The case against the State Department and Roosevelt's administration has been made even more powerfully by Arthur Morse and most recently by David Wyman.

As Elie Wiesel has observed, "the indifference of the Allies and friends wounded [survivors of the Holocaust] as deeply as the cruelty of the enemy. That the Nazis wished them dead, seemed 'normal'; besides, the Nazi propaganda hardly sought to hide that fact. But how is one to explain the silence of the others?"

DOCUMENTS

Introduction

Both documents are taken from interviews Sherna Berger Gluck did with women who had worked in wartime defense industries. She began interviewing in 1979.

The first document is from the interview with Fanny Christina Hill. Tina Hill was born in Texas in 1918. Her father was a farmer, and her mother worked as a domestic servant. Tina moved to Los Angeles before the war and worked as a live-in domestic. She went back to Texas to get married and returned to Los Angeles. Shortly after that, her husband went into the service. Tina got a job at North American Aviation. She continued to work at North American (which later became Rockwell International) until her retirement.

The second document comes from Gluck's interview with Marye Stumph, who was born in Ohio in 1909. Marye was married at nineteen and had two children in rapid succession before her husband left her and she went to work in a factory. Throughout all of this, she continued to live in Ohio. In 1940, she moved to California. She left her children with friends and went to business school while working part-time. The people with whom she had left her children returned to Ohio, and Marye was unable to support her family. Her son returned to Ohio with friends, and her daughter stayed with the Children's Home Society. In 1941, she got a job with Vultee Aircraft. Laid off at the end of the war, she took up office work and moved into civil service. She retired in 1974.

Questions for Discussion

1. Both Tina and Marye worked before the war. Was this unusual? Might this have influenced their decision to work in defense plants? If so, how so? How might the kind of work they did before the war have an impact on how they regarded their wartime jobs?

2. Women went to work for many reasons: patriotism, economic need, desire for a career. Why did Tina go to work? Why did Marye?

3. What happened to Tina and Marye after the war ended?

4. Tina faced discrimination both as a woman and as an African American. According to her, which was the greater disability in the workplace?
Fanny Christina Hill, "The black woman has worked all of her life."

My father was supposed to have been a farmer, but he just got by by doing a little bit of nothing. Some men are like that. Mama went to work and supported us the best she could. There were times we wouldn't have anything to eat if Mama hadn't gone to work. That's why you talk about women liberation and women go out to work? The black woman has worked all of her life and she really was the first one to go out to work and know how to make ends meet, because it was forced on her....

Negroes rented rooms quite a bit. It was a wonderful thing, 'cause it made it possible for you to come and stay without a problem. My sister and I was rooming with this lady and we was paying six dollars a week, which was good money, because she was renting the house for only twenty-six dollars a month. She had another girl living on the back porch and she was charging her three dollars. So you get the idea.

We were accustomed to shacking up with each other. We had to live like that because that was the only way to survive. Negroes, as a rule, are accustomed to a lot of people around. They have lived like that from slavery time on. We figured out how to get along with each other....

But they had to fight [to get jobs at North American]. They fought hand, tooth, and nail to get in there. And the first five or six Negroes who went in there, they were well educated, but they started them off as janitors. After they once got their foot in the door and was there for three months—you work for three months before they say you're hired—then they had to start fighting all over again to get off of that broom and get something decent. And some of them did.

But they'd always give that Negro man the worst part of everything. See, the jobs have already been tested and tried out before they ever get into the department, and they know what's good about them and what's bad about them. They always managed to give the worst one to the Negro. The only reason why the women fared better was they just couldn't quite give the woman as tough a job that they gave the men. But sometimes they did.

I can't exactly tell you what a tough job would be, but it's just like putting that caster on that little stand there. Let's face it, now you know that's light and you can lift that real easy, but there are other jobs twice as heavy as that. See, the larger the hole is, the thicker the drill, which would take you longer. So you know that's a tougher job. Okay, so they'd have the Negro doing that tough drilling. But when they got to the place where they figured out to get a drill press to drill with—which would be easier—they gave it to a white person. So they just practiced that and still do, right down to this day. I just don't know if it will ever get straight.

There were some departments, they didn't even allow a black person to walk through there let alone work in there. Some of the white people did not want to work with the Negro.
Marye Stumph, "I wanted to get my family back together."

The owner of the business school told us that we could go down to Third and Olive where they were training people for the defense plant. It was part of the Long Beach City College system. Well, naturally, I was interested in most any job because I wanted to get my family back together. It wasn't that I was particularly thinking about defense. That was just what came along. So I went down there right away. They were teaching us to work with simple wiring and pliers, things for electrical subassembly—which I never used when I did get out there.

I don't think I was there even six weeks when the foreman of the subassembly section at Vultee came down there and picked out some people to interview. It was July when I went to work. I started at 62.5 cents an hour. I thought I'd hit the mother lode!

That was the first time I'd ever worn slacks. I felt kind of funny because I didn't really have the figure for slacks. I was pretty buxom. Of course, we got quite used to it, and later I wore them all the time, even on my day off. We didn't have to wear safety shoes; most everybody wore leather oxfords. If you worked with any of the machinery, you were supposed to wear a hair net, and if you were working around welding, you wore goggles....

After a while, the supervisor wanted me to go on the spot-welding machine. It was a big, tall machine and you just sat there and ran the pieces together and the hot iron would just come down and hit it. It just welded in a little spot, like a needle. It wasn't anything that anybody couldn't do, but the men got all up in arms. They didn't want any women on there and they all protested. So I didn't get on the spot-welding machine.

I liked anything mechanical like that and I would have liked spot welding, but it didn't break my heart because I didn't....

By that time, the war had started and a lot of men started leaving and there were a lot of women. In fact, practically all those men on spot welding had to go into the service and they put women on the machines. Right in my own department, they never did put women on the really big, number five lathes. The men seemed to be professional machinists; they had a lot of experience and were able to do their own set-ups. Class A machinists were still men. The women got to be Class B machinists, which was as much as we expected to be. We weren't making a career of it like men. We were doing what was there to do.
CHAPTER 29

The American Century

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The Postwar Economy. After Roosevelt's death, Truman attempted to follow Roosevelt's policies at home and abroad. The first issue he confronted after the war was reconversion of the economy. At the war's end, most Americans wanted to demobilize the military, end wartime controls, and reduce taxes. Policymakers hoped to avoid both sudden economic dislocation and a return to the depression. Torn between these objectives, Truman vacillated. Yet the nation weathered demobilization with relative ease; pent-up consumer demand spurred production. However, inflation and labor unrest helped the Republicans to win control of Congress in 1946. In 1947, Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act, outlawing "closed shops" and authorizing the president to order an eighty-day cooling off period in strikes that threatened the national interest.

The Containment Policy. Stalin seemed intent on expanding Soviet power into central Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. By January 1946, Truman moved toward a tougher stand with respect to the Soviet Union. George F. Kennan, a foreign service officer, contended that the origins of Soviet expansionism lay in the instability and illegitimacy of the Soviet regime. He proposed that the United States firmly but patiently resist Soviet expansion wherever it appeared. Kennan never elaborated on how, precisely, the Soviet Union should be contained or in what parts of the world the policy should be applied.

The Atom Bomb: A "Winning" Weapon? Although Truman authorized the use of the atom bomb to force the surrender of Japan, he also hoped that it would serve as a counterweight to the numerically superior Red Army. Stalin, however, refused to be intimidated. In addition, horrifying accounts of the devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki left Americans uneasy. Truman came to doubt that the American people would permit the use of atomic weapons for aggressive purposes. In November 1945, the United States proposed that the United Nations supervise all production of nuclear energy. The U.N. created an Atomic Energy Commission, which put forward a plan for the eventual outlawing of atomic weapons backed by unrestricted U.N. inspections. The Soviets rejected the American and U.N. plans.

A Turning Point in Greece. In 1947, the policy of containment began to take shape. Responding to a communist threat in Greece, Truman asked Congress for economic and military aid for Greece and Turkey. The Truman Doctrine promised "to support free peoples resisting subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." In selling his proposal, Truman overstated the threat and couched the request in ideological terms.
The Marshall Plan and the Lesson of History. The economies of European countries remained unstable after the war. In 1947, Secretary of State George C. Marshall proposed a plan by which the United States would finance the reconstruction of the European economy. Western European powers eagerly seized upon Marshall's suggestion. Although initially tempted, Stalin declined to take part and insisted that eastern European nations do so as well. After the fall of Czechoslovakia in a communist coup in February 1948, Congress appropriated over $13 billion for the European recovery effort. The results were spectacular; by 1951, the economies of western Europe were booming. Western European nations moved toward social, cultural, and economic collaboration. Britain, France, and the United States created a single West German Republic from their zones of occupation. When the Soviets closed ground access to Berlin, the United States responded with an airlift that forced the Soviets to lift the blockade.

Dealing with Japan and China. Containment proved far less effective in the Far East than it did in Europe. American policy succeeded in Japan and failed in China. After the surrender of Japan, a four-power Allied Control Commission was established, but American forces, led by General MacArthur, controlled Japan and encouraged Japan's nascent democracy. Japan emerged economically strong, politically stable, and firmly allied with the United States. The problems in China were probably insurmountable. Truman dispatched George C. Marshall to negotiate a settlement between Chiang Kai-shek's nationalists and Mao Tse-tung's communists. This attempt at compromise failed, and civil war soon erupted.

The Election of 1948. By spring of 1948, public opinion polls revealed that most Americans considered Truman incompetent. He had alienated both southern conservatives and northern liberals. Truman still managed to win the nomination; but southern Democrats, known as "Dixiecrats," walked out when the convention adopted a strong civil rights plank and chose Strom Thurmond to run on a third-party ticket. Compounding matters, the left wing also defected; Henry A. Wallace ran on the Progressive ticket. The Republican nominee, Governor Thomas Dewey of New York, anticipating an easy victory, ran a listless campaign. Truman, in contrast, launched a vigorous campaign. His strong denunciation of the "do nothing" Republican Congress and the success of the Berlin Airlift aided his reelection bid. Many Democratic liberals thought Wallace too pro-Soviet and voted for Truman. Truman surprised everyone and won a narrow victory in the popular vote and a more substantial one in the electoral college. After the election, Truman put forward a number of proposals, which he called the Fair Deal. However, little of his program was enacted into law.

Containing Communism Abroad. During Truman's second term, the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union increasingly dominated attention. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, designed to protect the West from Soviet aggression, was formed in 1949. The Soviet detonation of an atomic bomb in September 1949 led Truman to authorize development of a hydrogen bomb. Containment failed in Asia. In China, Mao's communists defeated the nationalists. Chiang's forces fled in disarray to Formosa in 1949. Right-wing Republicans charged that Truman had not supported the Chinese nationalists strongly enough and had therefore "lost" China. Truman ordered a review of containment. The resulting
report, NSC-68, called for a massive expansion of the nation's armed forces. Although Truman initially had reservations about the document, events in Korea changed his mind.

**Hot War in Korea.** American policymakers had decided that a land war on the Asian continent would be impracticable. Yet when communist North Korea invaded South Korea in June 1950, Truman decided on a military response. Despite early gains by the North, U.N. forces (90 percent American) under the command of MacArthur turned the tide and began pressing north. MacArthur proposed the conquest of North Korea. Despite opposition from his civilian advisors, Truman authorized an advance as far as the Chinese border. In November 1950, 33 divisions of the People's Republic of China army crossed the Yalu River and shattered U.N. lines. MacArthur urged the bombing of Chinese installations north of the Yalu and a blockade of China. When Truman rejected his proposals, MacArthur openly criticized the administration. Truman removed MacArthur from command. In June 1951, the communists agreed to negotiations, which dragged on interminably. Initially, this "police action" was popular with the American public, but the bloody stalemate eroded public enthusiasm.

**The Communist Issue at Home.** The frustrating Korean War illustrated the paradox that, at the height of its power, American influence was waning. The United States faced internal as well as external threats. Exposure of communist espionage in Canada and Great Britain fueled American fears of communist subversion. Hoping to allay allegations that he was "soft" on communism, Truman established the Loyalty Review Board in 1947 to ensure that no subversives found employment in the federal government. The Hiss and Rosenberg trials heightened the climate of fear.

**McCarthyism.** In February 1950, Joseph R. McCarthy, an obscure senator from Wisconsin, charged that the State Department was "infested" with communists. Although he offered no evidence to support his claims, many Americans believed him. McCarthy went on to make more fantastic accusations. The enormity of his charges and the status of his targets convinced many that there had to be some truth in his accusations. Events of the early cold war and the public's resulting fears made people more susceptible to McCarthy's allegations.

**Dwight D. Eisenhower.** The Republican party selected Eisenhower as their candidate in 1952. Aside from his popularity as a war hero, Eisenhower's genial tolerance made a welcome change from Truman. His ability as a leader was amply demonstrated by his military career, and his campaign promise to go to Korea was a political masterstroke. Eisenhower easily defeated his Democratic opponent, Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois. Eisenhower dismantled no New Deal programs and undertook some modest new initiatives. Moreover, he adopted an essentially Keynesian approach to economic issues. Eisenhower proved to be a first-rate politician who knew how to be flexible without compromising basic values. In spite of his political skills, however, he was unable to recast the Republican party in his own, moderate, image.
The Eisenhower-Dulles Foreign Policy. The president and his secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, formulated a "New Look" in foreign policy, which reduced reliance on conventional forces and relied instead on America's nuclear arsenal to achieve international stability. This approach promised to save money and to prevent the United States from being caught up in another local conflict like the Korean War. Moreover, Dulles hoped the new approach would make it possible to "liberate" eastern Europe and "unleash" Chaing against the Chinese mainland. After the administration hinted at its willingness to use nuclear weapons, the Chinese signed an armistice that ended hostilities but left Korea divided. Threatened use of nuclear weapons also seemed to convince the Chinese to abandon their aggressive intent toward Quemoy and Matsu. The New Look did succeed in reducing the defense budget, but it did not lead to the liberation of eastern Europe. Further, unleashing Chaing would have been like pitting a Pekingese against a tiger. Above all, "massive retaliation" made little sense when the Soviet Union also possessed nuclear weapons.

McCarthy Self-Destructs. Even after it came under the control of his own party, McCarthy did not moderate his attacks on the State Department. Early in 1954, McCarthy finally overreached himself by leveling allegations at the army. Televised broadcasts of the Army-McCarthy Senate hearings revealed to the American public McCarthy's disregard for decency and truth. With Eisenhower quietly applying pressure behind the scenes, the Senate voted to censure McCarthy in 1954.

Asian Policy After Korea. Both Truman and Eisenhower provided aid to France's efforts to defeat the Viet Minh in Indochina. However, during the siege of Dien Bien Phu in 1954, Eisenhower refused to commit American personnel to the struggle. France soon surrendered; and France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China signed an agreement that divided Vietnam at the 17th parallel and called for a national election in 1956. North Vietnam, led by Ho Chi Minh, established a communist government. In South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem overthrew the emperor, and the United States provided support and advice to his new government. The planned election was never held, and Vietnam remained divided. Dulles organized the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO).

Israel and the Middle East. American policy in the Middle East was influenced by that region's massive petroleum reserves and by the conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbors. Truman consistently made support for Israel a priority, partly out of sympathy for the survivors of the Nazi holocaust and partly because of the political importance of the Jewish vote. Eisenhower and Dulles de-emphasized support for Israel. The United States provided economic aid to Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser but refused to sell him arms. The Soviets gladly provided the arms, and Nasser drifted toward the Eastern Bloc. In response, the United States withdrew its funding of the Aswan Dam. Nasser then nationalized the Suez Canal. An allied force of British, French, and Israeli forces attacked Egypt in October 1956. The United States and the Soviet Union eventually compelled the invaders to withdraw, and the crisis subsided. In January 1956, Eisenhower announced the "Eisenhower Doctrine," stating that the United States would use armed force anywhere in the Middle East "to halt aggression from any nation controlled by international communism."
Eisenhower and Khrushchev. Eisenhower defeated Stevenson by an even greater margin in 1956 than he had in 1952. The cold war escalated when United States detonated the first hydrogen bomb in 1952 and the Soviets followed suit within six months. After Stalin's death in 1953, his successor, Nikita Khrushchev, attempted to move the Soviet Union away from Stalinism. Abroad, Khrushchev courted many emerging nations by appealing to the anti-western prejudices of countries recently held as colonies and by offering economic and technological aid. Eisenhower understood that the United States maintained superiority in the nuclear arms race. Further, he was aware of the Soviet Union's many weaknesses. Nevertheless, the Soviet success in placing the Sputnik satellite in orbit alarmed many Americans. Eisenhower knew that, militarily, the Soviet Union was no match for the United States and that Sputnik had not changed the equation appreciably. Yet to call the Soviet bluff might prod Khrushchev to rash action. Eisenhower reassured the American people that they had little to fear and otherwise remained silent. Eisenhower exercised great restraint in the conduct of foreign policy, particularly when faced with a crisis. Although he had always guided foreign policy, Eisenhower took over much of the actual conduct of diplomacy after failing health forced Dulles to resign in 1959. Confronted with the threat of nuclear war moved the United States and the Soviet Union toward accommodation. In the summer of 1959, Vice-President Richard M. Nixon visited Moscow, and Khrushchev toured the United States in September. In this new air of cordiality, a date was set for a new summit meeting. This meeting never took place. On May 1, 1960, the Soviets shot down an American reconnaissance plane over Soviet territory, and Soviet-American relations quickly soured.

Latin America Aroused. The United States neglected Latin America in the postwar years. Like Truman, Eisenhower supported military governments in preference to communist revolutions. Violent anti-American rioting illustrated the depth of anti-Yankee sentiment and forced curtailment of Vice-President Nixon's "good-will" tour in 1958. In 1959, Fidel Castro overthrew Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista. Although Eisenhower quickly recognized the new Cuban government, Castro soon began to spout anti-American rhetoric; he also confiscated American property. When Castro established close relations with the Soviet Union, Eisenhower banned the importation of Cuban sugar. Khrushchev announced that American intervention in Cuba would be met with nuclear retaliation by the Soviet Union. Near the end of his second term, Eisenhower broke off relations with Cuba.

The Politics of Civil Rights. During the Cold War, America's treatment of its racial minorities took on added importance because of the ideological competition with communism. Moreover, America's blacks became increasingly unwilling to accept their status as second-class citizens. Truman had proposed civil rights reforms but failed to sway Congress. Eisenhower succeeded in integrating the military, but the direct assault on racial inequality came from the Supreme Court. In Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka (1954), the Court overturned the doctrine of "separate but equal." Although Eisenhower believed that equality could not be legislated, he refused to countenance defiance of federal authority or the Constitution. When the governor of Arkansas used the National Guard to prevent the execution of a federal court order upholding the right of a handful of black children to attend Little Rock's Central High School, Eisenhower nationalized the Arkansas Guard and sent federal troops to enforce the order. The Eisenhower administration gained passage of the
Civil Rights Act of 1957, which created a Civil Rights Commission and authorized the Department of Justice to ensure the right of southern blacks to register and to vote. The act, however, proved difficult to enforce.

**The Election of 1960.** Eisenhower reluctantly endorsed the candidacy of Vice-President Nixon. Nixon ran on the Eisenhower legacy and on his own reputation as a staunch anticommunist. The Democrats nominated John F. Kennedy, a senator from Massachusetts, and chose the Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, as his running mate. Although he had not been a particularly liberal congressman, Kennedy sought to appear more forward-looking as a presidential candidate. Kennedy benefited from his television presence during several debates with Nixon. In the end, Kennedy won a paper-thin victory in the popular vote.

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The economic problems associated with reconversion and why the American economy weathered the process of reconversion with relative ease.

2. The containment policy and its origins.


4. Why American policy was successful in Japan and a failure in China.

5. The outcome of the election of 1948.

6. The development of NATO.

7. The origins of the anticommunist hysteria of the late 1940s and early 1950s.

8. The reasons for McCarthy's success in using the issue of communist subversion and the reasons for his fall.


10. The contours of the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy.

11. The "New Look."

12. The sources of troubled relations with countries in Latin America.

13. The significance of *Brown v. Board of Education.*

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. What have been the consequences of the bulge in the population created by the postwar baby boom? What future consequences can you envision?

2. Was containment the only logical policy? Was it wise? Did it work?

3. What was the significance of Truman's decision not to ask Congress for a declaration of war in Korea?

4. What was the attraction of the New Look for the Eisenhower administration? How was it influenced by Korea? The text mentions that Europeans worried that Europe would become a nuclear battleground. Yet, at that time, many European leaders worried that the United States would not launch its missiles (and thereby risk retaliation on American cities) in order to save Europe from a Soviet invasion. If you were a West German leader in the 1950s, which would concern you more?

5. The “Mapping the Past” section states that Operation Dropshot “assumed” that the Soviet Union would attack Western Europe in approximately 1957. Does this mean that the Joint Chiefs of Staff actually predicted a Soviet attack at that time? Or does it mean that, for the purposes of that exercise, it posited a Soviet attack at that time (based, of course on calculations of Soviet capabilities and intentions)? Military planners develop plans for virtually every conceivable contingency. What, then, can historians learn from the plans for Operation Dropshot?

Beneath the surface, the 1950s was anything but calm and placid. The economy completed the transformation, begun in the 1920s, to a consumer economy. The population moved from cities to suburbs and from the North and East to the South and West. The baby boom generation began to reach school age, creating a crisis in the nation's schools. Veterans attended college on the GI Bill, and suddenly college students represented a broader spectrum of the population. Similarly, the culture of the 1950s was anything but calm. Social critics warned against the dangers of mass society. A new medium, television, revolutionized America's habits. And the fifties saw the emergence of a youth culture. As Todd Gitlin put it, the 1950s were "a seedbed as well as a cemetery. The surprises of the sixties were planted there."

One of the most notable elements of the youth culture was a new music the young could call their own. Two important cultural trends contributed to the evolution of this music. Television had a profound impact on radio. Drama and variety began to vanish from the radio; television could do that better. Radio therefore returned to the structure of the 1920s: music, news, weather. It provided a backdrop for whatever else was going on and company in the car. At the same time, jazz was becoming less danceable and more complex. Jazz was no longer hot; it had become cool. More and more, jazz was played for a few cognoscenti; in the process, it lost much of its popular appeal. A new music moved quickly to fill the void, and radio brought it to a mass audience.

Rock and roll could trace its ancestry back to the roots of jazz. As blacks migrated from the South to the urban centers of the North, they brought with them their music. This music was recorded on local record labels, sold in ghetto stores, and played on black radio. The industry called it "race music." That embarrassing term gave way, after World War II, to "rhythm and blues." It remained black music, played for a black audience by black artists such as Chuck Berry, Fats Domino, Little Richard, and Big Mama Thornton.

In 1952, a disk jockey in Cleveland, Alan Freed, introduced this music to a white audience on his show, "Moondog's Rock 'n' Roll Party." White artists began to play in a similar style. The first rock and roll song to break into the top ten was "Shake, Rattle, and Roll" by Bill Haley and His Comets (a white group). It reached the top ten in September 1954 and remained there for twelve weeks. That same year, Freed moved his radio show to station WINS in New York.

By then, white performers like Pat Boone had begun to cut "cover versions" of songs by black artists. The cover versions sanitized the lyrics and were performed in a less distinctively black style. Pat Boone had hits in 1955 with "Ain't That a Shame" (Fats Domino did the original) and "Tutti Frutti" (originally performed by Little Richard). Even "Shake, Rattle, and Roll" had originally been recorded by Joe Turner, and Bill Haley and His Comets cleaned up the language for their hit version. The same year that Boone had his two cover hits, "Blackboard Jungle," a film about young toughs in an urban high school starring Glenn Ford and Sidney Poitier, brought "Rock Around the Clock" by Bill Haley and His Comets to a large audience.

Early rock and roll usually contained a strong, driving base line and a simple melody line. The lyrics tended toward the simple; often they were not even words. One student of
rock and roll has observed that Little Richard "became more expressive with meaningless sounds...than he was with properly constructed songs."

In 1955, a white youth from Tupelo, Mississippi, who sang in a decidedly black style, had hits with "Blue Suede Shoes," "Heartbreak Hotel," and "Hound Dog" (originally recorded by Big Mama Thornton). Elvis Presley drove his fans into a hysterical frenzy and their parents into plain hysteria. Presley's gyrations earned him the nickname "Elvis the Pelvis" and caused parents and religious leaders fits of anxiety. One described Presley's performance as a "strip tease with clothes on."

Rock and roll quickly moved into the mainstream, although it continued to horrify parents and sometimes to frighten them. American Bandstand, a television show hosted by a well-dressed, polite, overage teenager named Dick Clark, helped move rock and roll into the mainstream. The show began as a local program in Philadelphia. On that show, neatly dressed white kids danced to essentially black music, and the world did not end. ABC picked up the show and broadcast it nationally beginning in 1957. The show played a role in bringing major black artists to a wider public. In 1956, Ed Sullivan relented and had Elvis on his show. Despite his distaste for Presley, Sullivan gave in to commercial pressures, and Presley appeared three times that year.

The emergence of rock and roll played an important role in the development of the youth culture. While once parents and their children had listened together to Dean Martin and Rosemary Clooney or watched Your Hit Parade on Saturday night, only the young listened to rock and roll. The fact that their parents hated it made it all the more compelling. Rock and roll played a central role in the emergence of a youth culture in the 1950s.

DOCUMENTS

Introduction

The text mentions Eisenhower's decision not to aid the French forces at Dien Bien Phu. Eisenhower did consider coming to the aid of the French, but only under certain circumstances. He insisted that, in order to obtain American assistance, the French had to internationalize the war and to promise freedom for the Associated States (Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam) after the defeat of the communists. The French would not agree to Eisenhower's terms, and Eisenhower refused to commit American forces.

The first document is from a letter Eisenhower wrote to Alfred Gruenther on April 26, 1954. Gruenther was on Eisenhower's staff during World War II, served as Ike's chief of staff at NATO, and later was himself Supreme Allied Commander of the NATO forces.

The second document is an excerpt from a letter Eisenhower wrote to Swede Hazlett, a boyhood friend, to whom Eisenhower wrote long, frank, and revealing letters. This letter was written the day after the letter to Gruenther.

The third document comes from the diary kept by James C. Hagerty, Eisenhower's press secretary. The excerpt is from the entry for April 26, 1954.


Questions for Discussion

1. What are Eisenhower's primary concerns in considering the situation at Dien Bien Phu and deciding whether to commit American forces?

2. Does it seem likely that Eisenhower would commit American ground forces? What might the consequences be if American planes were used to support the French?

3. Consider Eisenhower's statement that "if we were to put one combat soldier into Indochina, then our entire prestige would be at stake, not only in that area but throughout the world." Under John Kennedy, American soldiers began to assume combat roles. What were the consequences?
Letter from Dwight D. Eisenhower to Alfred Gruenther, April 26, 1954

As you know, you and I started more than three years ago trying to convince the French that they could not win the Indo-China war and particularly could not get real American support in that region unless they would unequivocally pledge independence to the Associated States upon the achievement of military victory. Along with this—indeed as a corollary to it—this administration has been arguing that no Western power can go to Asia militarily, except as one of a concert of powers, which concert must include local Asiatic peoples.

To contemplate anything else is to lay ourselves open to the charge of imperialism and colonialism or—at the very least—of objectionable paternalism. Even, therefore, if we could by some sudden stroke assure the saving of the Dien Bien Phu garrison, I think that under the conditions proposed by the French, the free world would lose more than it would gain.
Letter from Dwight D. Eisenhower to Swede Hazlett, April 27, 1954

In my last letter I remember that I mentioned Dien Bien Phu. It still holds out and while the situation looked particularly desperate during the past week, there now appears to be a slight improvement and the place may hold on for another week or ten days. The general situation in Southeast Asia, which is rather dramatically epitomized by the Dien Bien Phu battle, is a complicated one that has been a long time developing....

For more than three years I have been urging upon successive French governments the advisability of finding some way of "internationalizing" the war; such action would be proof to all the world and particularly to the Viet Namese that France's purpose is not colonial in character but is to defeat Communism in the region and to give the natives their freedom. The reply has always been vague, containing references to national prestige, Constitutional limitations, inevitable effects upon the Moroccan and Tunisian peoples, and dissertations on plain political difficulties and battles within the French Parliament. The result has been that the French have failed entirely to produce any enthusiasm on the part of the Vietnamese for participation in the war....

In any event, any nation that intervenes in a civil war can scarcely expect to win unless the side in whose favor it intervenes possesses a high morale based upon a war purpose or cause in which it believes. The French have used weasel words in promising independence and through this one reason as much as anything else, have suffered reverses that have been really inexcusable.
Legislative leaders meeting at 8:30...The President started the meeting with a discussion of Guatemala and Indochina....

Indochina. The President said that the French "are weary as hell." He said that it didn't look as though Dienbienphu could hold out for more than a week and would fall possibly sooner. Reported that the British thought that the French were not putting out as much as they could, but that he did not necessarily agree with their viewpoint. "The French go up and down every day—they are very volatile. They think they are a great power one day and they feel sorry for themselves the next day." The President said that if we were to put one combat soldier into Indochina, then our entire prestige would be at stake, not only in that area but throughout the world....The President said the situation looked very grim this morning, but that he and Dulles were doing everything they could to get the free countries to act in concert. In addition, he said "there are plenty of people in Asia, and we can train them to fight well. I don't see any reason for American ground troops to be committed in Indochina, don't think we need it, but we can train their forces and it may be necessary for us eventually to use some of our planes or aircraft carriers off the coast and some of our fighting craft we have in that area for support."
CHAPTER 30

From Camelot to Watergate

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The new president projected an image of youth and vigor. His administration prided themselves on being the best and the brightest. In reality, however, neither the president nor his administration lived up to the image.

The Cuban Crises. Kennedy believed that his chief task was to stop the spread of communism. In a departure from Eisenhower's reliance on America's nuclear deterrent, Kennedy proposed to challenge communist aggression wherever it occurred. Not long after taking power, he authorized an invasion of Cuba by Cuban exiles. The landing at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961 was a complete fiasco. The affair exposed the United States to all the criticism a straightforward assault would have, and it failed to overthrow Castro. Castro moved toward the Soviet orbit. In June 1961, Kennedy and Khrushchev met in Vienna, where Khrushchev blustered about taking West Berlin. In August, Khrushchev ordered construction of the Berlin Wall. Both sides resumed nuclear testing and built up massive nuclear arsenals. Kennedy also instructed the CIA to initiate "massive activity" against Castro's regime, which included attempts to assassinate the Cuban dictator. In October 1962, Khrushchev placed Soviet troops, bombers, and nuclear missiles in Cuba. Kennedy forced a showdown by ordering the United States Navy to halt the shipment of offensive weapons to Cuba. The world held its breath for several days until finally Khrushchev backed down. Although Kennedy's supporters regarded this as Kennedy's finest hour, in retrospect it appears that he overreacted. Both Kennedy and Khrushchev seem to have been sobered by the missile crisis. However, the humiliation Khrushchev suffered contributed to his overthrow by hardliners two years later.

The Vietnam War. After the French defeat in 1954, the parties agreed to general elections in 1956. Fearing that Ho Chi Minh would defeat him, Ngo Dinh Diem, the American-backed leader of South Vietnam, cancelled the election and, with American assistance, attempted to build a new nation. Viet Minh units that remained in the south (later known as Viet Cong) formed secret cells and waited. By the late 1950s, they had gained strength and become more militant. In May 1959, Viet Cong guerrillas began an insurgency that gave them control of large sections of the countryside. As a senator, Kennedy had backed Diem; moreover, he wanted to demonstrate his toughness after the Bay of Pigs. Thus, he began to expand the American commitment to Vietnam. By 1963, there were over 16,000 American military personnel in South Vietnam, and 120 American soldiers had been killed. In spite of that effort, Diem's regime was faltering by 1963. A devoted Catholic, Diem cracked down on Buddhists, who resisted. Kennedy sent word to dissident Vietnamese generals that he would support them if they ousted Diem. The generals took power on November 1 and killed Deim. Some have argued that Kennedy would not have continued the course on which he embarked. The evidence indicates otherwise.
"We Shall Overcome": The Civil Rights Movement. Kennedy initially approached the question of race with extreme caution. His narrow victory in 1960 depended on votes of both African Americans and white southerners. In the post-World War II years, America's southern blacks embarked on a grass-roots campaign for equality. When Rosa Parks refused to surrender her seat to a white and was arrested for violating Montgomery, Alabama's segregation ordinance, the black community responded by boycotting the city's buses. The boycott began in December 1955 and ended with a Supreme Court decision striking down the city's segregation laws. Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., a charismatic and gifted orator, emerged as the leader of the boycott. The success in Montgomery inspired blacks across the South. In 1957, King formed a new organization, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to further the struggle for civil rights.

In February 1960, four black students staged a "sit-in" at a Woolworth lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina. This inspired similar actions across the South. Blacks and whites tested federal regulations prohibiting discrimination on interstate transportation in the "freedom rides" of 1961. The protracted struggle gradually broke down legal racial barriers in the South. Some African Americans became impatient with the pace of change, and black nationalism became a potent force. Elijah Muhammad, leader of the Black Muslims, called for the establishment of separate black and white nations and rejected nonviolence.

In 1963, King and the SCLC staged massive demonstrations in Birmingham, during which King was arrested. In jail, King wrote his "Letter from a Birmingham Jail." The brutal response to the demonstrations in Birmingham pushed Kennedy to change his policy and lend his support to a modest civil rights bill. When the bill stalled in Congress, civil rights groups organized a massive demonstration in Washington, at which King gave his "I Have a Dream" speech.

Tragedy in Dallas: JFK Assassinated. While visiting Dallas, Texas, on November 22, 1963, Kennedy was assassinated. Police apprehended Lee Harvey Oswald, and a mass of evidence linked him to the assassination. Before he could be brought to trial, he was murdered by Jack Ruby. An investigation headed by Chief Justice Warren concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone, and although there is little evidence to support the theory that Oswald was part of a larger conspiracy, many doubted the Warren Commission's conclusion.

Lyndon Baines Johnson. From 1949 until his election as vice-president, Johnson served in the Senate, for most of that time as Senate Democratic leader. A master of manipulation, Johnson could use both heavy-handed and subtle approaches to gain his objectives. He modeled himself after Franklin Roosevelt and had a commitment to social welfare legislation. In this, he differed markedly from Kennedy. Kennedy's inaugural address made no mention of domestic policy. When Congress blocked his modest domestic agenda, Kennedy reacted mildly. Johnson sought power because he "wanted to use it." On assuming office, he exploited the atmosphere surrounding Kennedy's assassination to push an expanded version of Kennedy's legislative agenda through Congress.
The Great Society. Johnson pushed through passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, an expanded version of Kennedy's bill. Aspiring to be a great reformer in the tradition of FDR, Johnson declared war on poverty in America and set out to create a "Great Society" in which poverty would no longer exist. The war on poverty intended to give poor people the opportunity to improve themselves. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 created the Job Corps, provided for education for small children, and established work study programs for college students. After his sweeping victory over the unabashedly conservative Barry Goldwater in 1964, Johnson pressed for further reforms. Under his leadership, Congress passed the Medicare Act (1965), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), and the Voting Rights Act (1965). Other programs provided support for the arts and for scientific research, highway safety, crime control, slum clearance, clean air and water, and the preservation of historic sites. While the scope and intent of the Great Society programs were truly remarkable, in practice they often failed to have the impact the president had desired.

Johnson Escalates the War. After Diem's assassination, the situation in South Vietnam continued to deteriorate. In spite of a series of military coups, Johnson believed that he had no choice but to support the regime in South Vietnam. Alarmed over the growing successes of the Vietcong, President Johnson engaged in a gradual buildup of American forces in Vietnam. Johnson used the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to justify escalation of the United States' role in Vietnam. By the middle of 1968, more than 538,000 Americans were engaged in a full-scale war that Congress had never declared.

Opposition to the War. Some Americans opposed their country's involvement in Vietnam. They objected to the repressive nature of the government of South Vietnam, the massive aerial bombings, the civilian casualties, the cost of the war, and the loss of American lives. Johnson refused to ask Congress to raise taxes to pay for the war, which caused inflation. His statements about the war were often disingenuous. Nevertheless, he and his advisers believed that they were defending freedom. Although it eventually became evident that military victory was impossible, American leaders were slow to grasp that fact.

The Election of 1968. Opposition to the war grew; it was particularly vehement on college campuses. In 1967, Senator Eugene McCarthy, a Democrat from Minnesota, launched a bid for his party's nomination based on his opposition to the war. The Tet Offensive in 1968 and news that the administration was considering a request to dispatch an additional 206,000 American troops to Vietnam dramatically altered the balance of power in the Democratic party. McCarthy won 42 percent of Democrats who voted in the New Hampshire primary. After McCarthy's strong showing, former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy entered the Democratic race. After much soul-searching, Johnson announced that he would not seek reelection. Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey then entered the contest. McCarthy and Kennedy each won primaries. After winning a narrow victory in California, Kennedy was assassinated. The Democratic party's convention in Chicago, racked by great turmoil, nominated Humphrey. Former Vice-President Richard M. Nixon won the Republican nomination and chose Spiro T. Agnew of Maryland as his running mate. Although far behind in the early stages of the campaign, Humphrey gained ground, and Nixon won the 1968 election with a popular margin of less than 500,000 votes. The Independent candidate,
George Wallace of Alabama, ran an anti-black, anti-intellectual, and hawkish campaign. He received 46 electoral votes and about 13.5 percent of the popular vote.

**Nixon as President: "Vietnamizing the War."** Nixon projected the image of calm, deliberate statesmanship. Nixon considered his major challenge to be finding an acceptable solution to the war in Vietnam. As a candidate, he pledged to end the war on "honorable terms." Nixon proposed to build up the South Vietnamese armed forces so that American troops could withdraw without the communists overrunning the South (Vietnamization). However, the United States had failed for 15 years to make the South Vietnamese capable of defending themselves. At home, the peace movement grew in size and militancy. In October and November 1969, hundreds of thousands of peace marchers converged on Washington, D.C., during Moratorium Days. On November 3, in a televised statement, Nixon announced plans to bring home all U.S. ground forces. The withdrawal of American troops continued, and a new lottery system for drafting men eliminated some inequities of the old system. However, the war continued, and the human costs of a stalemate war along with revelations of atrocities committed by American troops gave new momentum to the peace movement.

**The Cambodian "Incursion."** In April 1970, Nixon announced the withdrawal of another 150,000 American soldiers and declared that Vietnamization was proceeding ahead of schedule. One week later, he authorized an incursion into Cambodian territory to destroy communist bases there. The nation's college campuses erupted in protest. At Kent State University in Ohio, after days of demonstrations, National Guardsmen killed four students. State police killed two students at Jackson State University in Mississippi. A wave of student actions closed hundreds of colleges and universities across the nation. Faced with this turmoil, the president increased the pace of troop withdrawals, but escalated American bombing raids over North Vietnam. He also ordered the mining of Haiphong and other northern ports.

**Détente with Communism.** In the midst of his aggressive actions in Vietnam, Nixon and his foreign policy advisor, Henry Kissinger, embarked on an epic diplomatic venture. Rather than treating communism as a monolith, Nixon and Kissinger dealt with Russia and China as separate powers. In February 1972, Nixon became the first American president to visit the People's Republic of China. He followed this unprecedented move by meeting with the Soviet leadership in Moscow in May. Nixon returned from Moscow with a treaty calling for the limiting of strategic arms (SALT). This new policy, known as détente, meant a relaxation of tensions. It enabled the United States to play off the two communist superpowers against each other. By October 1972, Kissinger had negotiated a draft settlement with the North Vietnamese. Shortly before the election, he announced that "peace was at hand."

**Nixon in Triumph.** Nixon won a landslide victory over the Democratic nominee, George McGovern, in 1972. McGovern's campaign had been hampered by factionalism within his party, his bumbling oratorical style, and his tendency to advance poorly thought out proposals. Nixon blew huge holes in the Democratic coalition. He won in the South and among northern blue-collar workers. With his anti-inflationary policies, détente, and the prospects of peace in Vietnam, Nixon appeared to be a successful and powerful president.
However, Kissinger's agreement with the North Vietnamese fell apart when Nguyen Van Thieu, South Vietnam's president, refused to sign it. After attempting to extract more favorable terms from the North Vietnamese by ordering extensive bombing of the North, Nixon finally reached a settlement with the North Vietnamese in January 1973. The United States lost more than 57,000 lives and spent more than $150 billion in Vietnam.

**Domestic Policy Under Nixon.** The most serious issue Nixon faced was the high rate of inflation caused primarily by the large military outlays of the Johnson administration and its refusal to raise taxes. Nixon balanced the 1969 federal budget, and the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates. Prices continued to rise, however, and in 1970 Congress passed legislation giving the president power to regulate wages and prices. Although Nixon did not favor this legislation, he implemented it the following year. Phase II of his anti-inflationary policies involved the creation of a pay board and a price commission to limit wage and price increases after the freeze ended. Inflation slowed but did not stop.

Nixon did not pursue a rigidly conservative course. He proposed a bold plan for a minimum income for poor families, which alarmed his conservative supporters and failed to pass Congress. The president signed the Clean Air Act of 1970 and legislation creating the Environmental Protection Agency. On the other hand, Nixon's southern strategy sought the support of southern conservative Democrats by pulling back on the federal government's commitment to school desegregation and by appointing, for the most part, conservative justices to the Supreme Court.

After his triumphant reelection and the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, Nixon attempted to change the direction in which the nation had been moving for decades. While strengthening the presidency vis-a-vis Congress, he sought to decentralize administration by returning various functions to state and local government. He also set out to reduce the role of government in people's lives. These aims brought him into conflict with liberals of both parties. In an effort to combat inflation, Nixon set a limit on federal spending. To keep within that limit, he impounded (refused to spend) funds Congress had appropriated. Critics began to grumble about an "imperial presidency."

**The Watergate Break-in.** On March 19, 1973, James McCord, an employee of the Committee to Re-Elect the president (CREEP) and accused burglar, wrote a letter to Judge John Sirica revealing that high-level Republican officials had prior knowledge of the break-in at the Democratic headquarters in the Watergate Hotel in Washington, D.C., on June 17, 1972.

Nixon denied the involvement of anyone in the White House. Soon after, however, Jeb Stuart Magruder, head of CREEP, and John W. Dean III, legal counsel to the president, admitted their involvement. Subsequent to these revelations, Nixon dismissed Dean; and most of the president's closest advisers, including H.R. Haldeman, John Ehrlichman, and Richard Kleindienst, resigned.

Dean then charged that the president had participated in an attempted cover-up of the affair. Subsequent grand jury investigations and the findings of a Senate investigation headed by Sam Ervin of North Carolina revealed that the president had acted to obstruct investigations into the matter. Investigations also revealed that the president and his staff had abused the powers of their offices and orchestrated a vast array of illegal and unethical
practices during the election campaign. The Senate Watergate committee learned of the existence of tapes Nixon had made of White House conversations. Nixon refused to surrender these tapes to the committee. This led to calls for his resignation, even impeachment. In response, Nixon appointed a special prosecutor to investigate the affair. Archibald Cox, the prosecutor, soon aroused the president's ire by seeking access to records, including the tapes. Nixon ordered Cox fired. Rather than dismiss Cox, Attorney General Elliot Richardson and his deputy, William Ruckelshaus, resigned. Robert Bork, the solicitor general, carried out Nixon's order. The "Saturday Night Massacre" outraged the public. The House Judiciary Committee considered impeachment. Nixon backed down; he named a new prosecutor, Leon Jaworski, and turned the tapes over to Sirica. However, some of the tapes were missing, and an important section of another had been deliberately erased.

More Troubles for Nixon. As the Watergate drama unfolded, a number of unrelated crises emerged. Food prices soared, in part because of grain shortages caused by massive sales to the Soviets. Vice-President Agnew, champion of law and order, resigned after pleading nolo contendere to charges of accepting bribes and committing tax fraud while serving in public office in Maryland. Nixon nominated, and Congress confirmed, Gerald Ford, a congressman from Michigan, as vice-president. Nixon's integrity was further tarnished after revelations that he had taken huge tax deductions on the donation of his vice-presidential papers to the National Archives and that millions of dollars of public funds had been used to renovate his private homes in Florida and California.

The Judgment on Watergate: "Expletive Deleted." In March 1974, a federal grand jury indicted Haldeman, Ehrlichman, Mitchell, and four other White House aides on charges of conspiracy to obstruct justice in the Watergate investigations. Nixon was named as an "unindicted co-conspirator." Nixon released edited transcripts of the White House tapes to the press. Not only were the tapes incriminating, they also exposed a sordid side of Nixon's character. Even some of his strongest supporters demanded Nixon's resignation. Moreover, once the Judiciary Committee obtained the tapes, it became clear that the transcripts had excluded material adverse to the president. In the summer of 1974, the House Judiciary Committee, in televised proceedings, voted to adopt three articles of impeachment against the president. Nixon was charged with obstructing justice, abusing the powers of his office, and failing to comply with the committee's subpoenas. On the eve of the debates, the Supreme Court ruled that Nixon had to turn over 64 additional tapes to the special prosecutor. Nixon considered defying the Court but, in the end, complied. The tapes proved conclusively that Nixon had been in on the cover-up from its earliest stages. Virtually all of his remaining support in Congress evaporated.

The Meaning of Watergate. Facing certain impeachment and conviction, on August 9, 1974, Nixon became the first president to resign. Gerald Ford became president. Shortly after taking office, Ford pardoned Nixon for any crimes he had committed in office. Nixon's policy of détente marked an easing of cold war tensions; the failure of his interventionist domestic policies signaled growing disillusionment with Johnson's Great Society.
POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. Kennedy's failure to enact significant domestic legislation.

2. Kennedy's approach to foreign policy.

3. The origins and evolution of a grass-roots movement for racial equality.

4. Johnson's approach to his war on poverty.

5. The results of the Great Society's legislative program.


7. The positions and arguments of Hawks and Doves.

8. The factors contributing to Nixon's victory in 1968.


10. The policy of "Vietnamization."

11. Domestic events following Nixon's incursion into Cambodia.

12. The policy of détente.


14. The sequence of events, beginning with the Watergate break-in, which led to Nixon's resignation.
POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. The text suggests that Kennedy failed to gain his legislative objectives because of a coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats. Yet the composition of Congress was virtually identical in the 1950s, and the Eisenhower administration obtained passage of two civil rights acts, the highway program, extensions of social security, an increase in the minimum wage, and other minor expansions of the New Deal. Is the text's observation an adequate explanation of Kennedy's legislative failures? If it is not, what alternative explanations would you propose?

2. Discuss the economic and social consequences of the war in Vietnam.

3. The Chicago police engaged in what a presidential commission called a "police riot" during the Democratic convention in 1968. They savagely beat demonstrators, bystanders, and reporters. The text notes that they were "provoked by the abusive language and violent behavior of radical demonstrators." Granting the provocation, would anything justify the behavior of Chicago's police force?

4. On what grounds did students object to the war in Vietnam? Which of the arguments seems most compelling?

5. In what ways did Nixon's activities threaten the American system of government? Watergate forced Nixon's resignation, but did the system work?

6. What might the experience of Little Rock (see the “Mapping the Past” section) indicate about the maps showing national patterns of desegregation in the same section?

7. As the “Debating the Past” section indicates, the weight of historical evidence argues against the notion that Kennedy would have withdrawn American forces from Vietnam. Why, then, does that notion continue to appeal to historians such as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and filmmakers such as Oliver Stone?
Lyndon Johnson took the oath of office aboard the presidential airplane on November 22, 1963. His wife stood on one side, and Jackie Kennedy, still wearing a dress splattered with blood from the events of that morning, stood on the other. America was shocked by the assassination of John Kennedy. Television brought the events in Dallas into everyone's home. Throughout this national trauma, Johnson acted with restraint and calm. His demeanor reassured a shaken nation.

Johnson's uncharacteristic restraint during that time revealed something of the paradox of Lyndon Johnson. He towered over American domestic life. He left a record of accomplishment in domestic legislation that has rarely, if ever, been equaled. He was the architect of the Great Society, which expanded and completed the New Deal agenda. His programs included many who had been excluded from the New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier. His margin of victory in the electoral college in 1964 had been exceeded to that time only by Roosevelt's annihilation of Alf Landon in 1936. Johnson's 61 percent of the popular vote exceeded even Roosevelt's in 1936.

Yet Johnson is remembered for Vietnam, for being president while race riots devastated America's cities and while college campuses exploded in protest.

A Harris poll in 1976 asked respondents to rank the presidents from Roosevelt to Ford. Only 2 percent thought Johnson did the best job. Only 1 percent said he inspired the most confidence. Perhaps understandably, 1 percent found him the most personally appealing president. Even in domestic affairs, however, the public judged him harshly. Only 8 percent thought he did the best job in that area.

Yet Johnson became president with incomparable legislative skill and a commitment to activism. No one surpassed his ability in dealing with Congress. Probably no president this century has shared his concern for the suffering of the disadvantaged. He once said that "nothing makes a man come to grips more directly with his conscience than the presidency." How could such an able and experienced leader who won an unprecedented mandate decline so precipitously in the public's estimation in so short a time? The answer is complex, but part of the answer lies in the character of Lyndon Johnson.

Johnson rose from a small farm in Southwest Texas to the House of Representatives, to the Senate, to the leadership of his party in the Senate, to the vice-presidency, and finally to the White House.

He was a master of bending others to his will. Roland Evans and Robert Novak wrote that the Johnson "treatment was an almost hypnotic experience and rendered the target stunned and helpless." He was one of the most powerful and effective leaders in the history of the Senate.

No one knows why he accepted the offer of the nomination for the vice-presidency, an office he detested. He must have felt great exhilaration on assuming the presidency, but, if he did, he kept the emotion hidden.

In the days after becoming president, he functioned as a conciliator. He kept Kennedy's cabinet. The theme of his first address was "let us continue." He then took Kennedy's modest programs and expanded them beyond anything Kennedy had envisioned.

Johnson kept Kennedy's cabinet, partly because they were in place and partly as a symbol of continuity. In doing so, however, he inherited an administration of strangers, and
hostile ones at that. Kennedy's men were shocked; many of them adored Kennedy. They looked on Johnson as an outsider, a usurper, a heathen. Bobby Kennedy resigned, but the others stayed. And Johnson took delight in humiliating them.

Johnson suffered from an image problem. In the public mind, he did not compare favorably to Kennedy. He was older, ugly, and spoke with a southern accent. He was not intellectual, contemplative, or a reader of books. Neither, for that matter, was Kennedy, but the public attributed those traits to the late president, and the way in which Johnson came to the presidency heightened the contrast.

Moreover, Johnson was a paradox—the ultimate Washington insider who remained an outsider, a ruffian, a Texan. He was sensitive to criticism by "overbred smart alecks who live in Georgetown and think in Harvard." His alienation was complicated by a desire to gain acceptance from these people.

Johnson wanted desperately to be liked and loved. He once wondered out loud to Dean Acheson why people loved Kennedy and not him. Acheson replied: "Because, Mr. President, you are not a very likeable man." Acheson was right. Johnson had a domineering personality. He had a cruel streak. A friend described Johnson as "a sonofabitch, a great sonofabitch." It always seemed to escape Johnson that people do not like sons of bitches, even when they are great.

Johnson could be vulgar, crude, and earthy. He summoned cabinet officials and aides to his bathroom. He held up beagles by their ears. Johnson had a passion for secrecy and a talent for manipulation, which widened his credibility gap.

Johnson wrote in his memoirs that every president must establish a "right to govern." For Johnson, winning an election was not enough. A president had to develop a "moral underpinning" to his power. Johnson did not succeed in this area. He was magnificent person to person or in dealing with small groups, but he could never project his dynamism and charm to large audiences. Above all, he was terrible on television. He handled the press badly as well.

Nevertheless, Johnson's failure, and that of his programs, may well have lay in a different area. His political ideas were shaped by the depression and the New Deal. He carried those values into the 1960s, which rejected them. He was a master manipulator when a younger generation called on people to "do your own thing." Johnson believed in institutions (government, business, universities, trade unions) when radicals challenged their legitimacy. Johnson believed in heroes in an age of the anti-hero.

This conflict shaped his Great Society. The issues of the 1930s were quantitative: jobs, security, housing. The issues of the prosperous 1960s were qualitative: civil rights, education, the environment. It was easy to build a bridge and easy to quantify its benefits. It was more difficult to send a teacher to a substandard school with instructions to improve reading. Johnson believed that the way to deal with domestic problems was to spend money on them. However, many of the problems of the 1960s proved intractable. Spending money alone did not work. Many problems were structural in origin. One can pass legislation guaranteeing blacks the right to vote, but that does not address the deeper problem of racism in American society.

The Great Society was everything the New Deal should have been and was not. However, it may have been too little and too late by the 1960s. More important, its approach may not even have been relevant by the 1960s.
DOCUMENTS

Introduction

The Cuban Missile Crisis has often been described as Kennedy's greatest triumph. There are, however, grounds on which to question that conclusion. In recent years, some historians have concluded that Kennedy's decision to go to the brink of nuclear war was both reckless and unnecessary.

The first document is the opening of Kennedy's address to the American people on October 22, 1962. The second document is an excerpt from a transcript of the Executive Committee (Excomm) meeting on October 16, 1962. Kennedy secretly taped the proceedings of these, and other, meetings of his administration. "Sanitized" (censored) transcripts of the tapes are available from the Kennedy Library.


Questions for Discussion

1. Kennedy says in his speech that the missiles in Cuba "add to an already clear and present danger." Do the discussions in the Excomm bear out that assertion?

2. If McNamara was correct and the missiles posed a political, rather than a military, problem, were the solutions discussed appropriate? In the meeting they discussed a tactical air strike, a massive air strike, an invasion, and eventually a blockade. What option or options did they not discuss?
Address by President John Kennedy, October 22, 1962

Good evening, my fellow citizens. This Government, as promised, has maintained the closest surveillance of the Soviet military build-up on the island of Cuba. Within the past week unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purposes of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere.

Upon receiving the first preliminary hard information of this nature last Tuesday morning (October 16) at 9:00 a.m., I directed that our surveillance be stepped up. And now having confirmed and completed our evaluation of the evidence and our decision on a course of action, this Government feels obliged to report this new crisis to you in fullest detail.

The characteristics of these new missile sites indicate two distinct types of installations. Several of them include medium-range ballistic missiles capable of carrying a nuclear warhead for a distance of more than 1,000 nautical miles. Each of these missiles, in short, is capable of striking Washington, D.C., the Panama Canal, Cape Canaveral, Mexico City, or any other city in the southeastern part of the United States, in Central America, or in the Caribbean area.

Additional sites not yet completed appear to be designed for intermediate-range ballistic missiles capable of traveling more than twice as far—and thus capable of striking most of the major cities in the Western Hemisphere, ranging as far north as Hudson Bay, Canada, and as far south as Lima, Peru. In addition, jet bombers, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, are now being uncrated and assembled in Cuba, while the necessary air bases are being prepared.

This urgent transformation of Cuba into an important strategic base—by the presence of these large, long-range, and clearly offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction—constitutes an explicit threat to the peace and security of all the Americas, in flagrant and deliberate defiance of the Rio Pact of 1947, the traditions of this nation and Hemisphere, the Joint Resolution of the Eighty-seventh Congress, the Charter of the United Nations, and my own public warnings to the Soviets on September 4 and 13.

This action also contradicts the repeated assurances of Soviet spokesmen, both publicly and privately delivered, that the arms build-up in Cuba would retain its original defensive character and that the Soviet Union had no need or desire to station strategic missiles on the territory of any other nation . . .

In that sense missiles in Cuba add to an already clear and present danger—although it should be noted the nations of Latin America have never previously been subjected to a potential nuclear threat.

But this secret, swift, and extraordinary build-up of Communist missiles—in an area well known to have a special and historical relationship to the United States and the nations of the Western Hemisphere, in violation of Soviet assurances, and in defiance of American and hemispheric policy—this sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil - is a deliberately provocative and unjustifiable change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country if our courage and our commitments are ever to be trusted again by either friend or foe.
Transcript of Excomm meeting, October 16, 1962

Bundy: But, the, uh, question I would like to ask is, quite aside from what we've said—and we're very hard-locked into it, I know—What is the strategic impact on the position of the United States of MRBMs in Cuba? How gravely does it change the strategic balance?

McNamara: Mac, I asked the Chiefs that this afternoon, in effect. And they said, substantially. My own personal view is not at all.

Bundy: Not so much.

McNamara: And, I think this is an important element here....

********

[discussion of the psychological impact of Soviet weapons in Cuba]

Douglas Dillon: Yeah. That is the point.

Edwin M. Martin: Yeah. The psychological factor of our having taken it.

Dillon: Taken it, that's the best.

RFK: Well, and the fact that if you go there, we're gonna fire it.

JFK: What's that again, Ed? What are you saying.

Martin: Well, it's a psychological factor that we have sat back and let em do it to us, that is more important than the direct threat...

JFK: [unintelligible] I said we weren't going to.

Martin: [unintelligible]

Bundy(?): That's something we could manage.

JFK: Last month I said we weren't going to.

[laughter]

JFK: Last month I should have said...

Speaker: Well...

JFK: ...that we don't care. But when we said we were not going to and they go ahead and do it, and then we do nothing, then...

Speaker: That's right.

JFK: ...I would think that our risks increase. Oh, I agree. What difference does it make? They've got enough to blow us up now anyway. I think it's just a question of ... After all this is a political struggle as much as military....

********

[McNamara advocates examining political response—"We haven't discussed it fully today."]

McNamara: I, I, I'll be quite frank. I don't think there is a military problem here. This is my answer to Mac's question....

Bundy: That's my honest [judgment(?)].
McNamara: ...and therefore, and I’ve gone through this today, and I asked myself, Well what is it then if it isn't a military problem? Well, it's just exactly this problem, that, that, uh, if Cuba should possess a capacity to carry out offensive actions against the U.S., the U.S. would act.

Speaker: That's right.

McNamara: Now, it's that problem, this...

Speaker: You can't get around that one.

McNamara: ...this is a domestic political problem....

[McNamara suggested blockade and 24-hour surveillance. George Ball pointed out that 24-hour surveillance has holes—can't monitor during darkness.]

McNamara: Oh, well, it's really the, yes, it isn't the surveillance, it's the ultimatum that is...

Ball (?): Yeah.

McNamara: ...the key part of this.

Ball (?): Yeah.

McNamara: And what I tried to do was develop a little package that meets the action requirement of the paragraph I read.

Speaker: Yeah.

McNamara: Because, as I suggested, I don't believe it's primarily a military problem. It's primarily a, a domestic, political problem.
CHAPTER 31
Society in Flux

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

A Society on the Move. The decades after World War II were marked by rapid and profound change. Depression gave way to prosperity, yet race and gender excluded some from equal access to jobs and education. Technology advanced with breathtaking speed, and technological change contributed to social change. Americans were geographically mobile. The automobile contributed to that mobility and had a tremendous impact on American life. Travel by car led to the development of a new business, motels (a combination of motor and hotel). The construction of the interstate highway system also contributed to the mobility of Americans; although it came with ecological costs. Jet aircraft spurred the growth of commercial air travel.

The Advent of Television. Television grew dramatically during the 1950s. It rapidly became an indispensable means of political communication. TV both covered the news and provided a vehicle for political advertising. In doing so, it changed American politics. Although it produced some quality dramas, documentaries, and children's programs, the general level of programming was poor. Yet children and their parents found the new medium fascinating. In the 1980s, the rapid growth of cable television diminished the importance of the networks and increased the variety of programming available to viewers. Videotape recorders also changed the viewing habits of Americans.

At Home and Work. The wartime trend toward earlier marriages and larger families accelerated with the war's end. Government policies, such as income tax deductions for dependents, further encouraged the inclination of people to have children. Household management and child rearing became the career of choice for millions of American women, including college graduates. Scholars supported the notion that women belonged in the home. Although men assumed prominent roles in some domestic rituals, they were expected to cede management of the domestic sphere to women. A man's primary contribution to the family was to earn enough to sustain it. Unemployment remained low, but the character or work changed in unsettling ways. Large corporations depended on increasing numbers of managers and clerical workers. Entrepreneurial individuals gave way to "organization men" and the need to conform. Attitudes toward marriage and child rearing spanned the spectrum of American society. The growth of suburbs gave a physical dimension to emerging ideas of family life. Much as it reinforced the desire to have larger families, government policies encouraged the growth of suburbs. Not all women in the suburbs lived the life portrayed in television situation comedies. Substantial numbers worked outside the home, particularly in the clerical and service sectors of the economy.
**The Growing Middle Class.** The middle class expanded rapidly and at the same time became more culturally homogeneous. Tens of thousands of blue-collar workers entered the middle class, and the percentage of immigrants in the population declined.

**Religion in Changing Times.** After World War II, attendance at churches and synagogues rose, and in 1954 Congress passed a law adding “under God” to the Pledge of Allegiance. The next year, Congress added the words “In God We Trust” to the nation’s currency. At the same time, religious toleration became much more the norm. Churches became more secular in orientation and contributed to the growing trend of conformity. The civil rights movement involved many mainstream clergymen and religions in political activism. Feminist critics challenged religious assumptions. Science and technology also influenced religion. Some people had never made peace with Darwinian theories of evolution and wanted creationist theories taught in schools. Medical science created new ethical problems. Television provided a pulpit from which religious leaders could reach far larger audiences. Evangelical preachers proved to be the most adept at using the electronic media. By the 1970s, a militant fundamentalist brand of preachers dominated the airwaves. They preached not only conservative religious values, but conservative political and social views as well. A series of scandals in the 1980s diminished the influence of the televangelists.

**Literature and Art.** Although it did not equal the outpouring of literary effort after World War I, the postwar era produced some fine writers, particularly novelists such as Norman Mailer, J. D. Salinger, Saul Bellow, Joseph Heller, and John Updike. Sales of paperbacks grew enormously. The expansion of the book market had drawbacks as well as benefits. With enormous profits to be made, publishers tended to favor established authors, which made it even more difficult for unknown writers to earn a living.

A genuinely American expression of art emerged with the "New York school." Abstract expressionists, such as Jackson Pollock, approached art subjectively. Other experiments included op art (the use of pure complementary colors to produce dynamic optical effects) and pop art, which satirized aspects of American culture.

**The Perils of Progress.** Americans seemed to confront two dilemmas in the 1960s. First, progress was often self-defeating. Consumer products, designed to make life better, often produced waste products that polluted the environment. Second, modern industrial society placed a premium on social cooperation, but, at the same time, it undermined the individual's sense of importance in society. President Johnson responded by trying to build a "consensus," but none emerged.

**The Costs of Prosperity.** The economy continued to expand rapidly, and inflationary pressures built. Technological advances that created new products and new industries accounted in part for the economic expansion. Computers began to revolutionize business and production. Technology increased the capacity to support a larger population, but the growing population strained the supply of resources.

**New Racial Turmoil.** In spite of significant gains, radicalism won more and more converts among black activists in the 1960s. SNCC, an organization born out of the sit-ins and
committed to integration, rejected integration and interracial cooperation after experiencing violence and intimidation while trying to register black voters and to organize schools for black children in the Deep South. The election of Stokely Carmichael as chairman of SNCC indicated the growing strength of "Black Power." Urban riots also manifested black impatience, frustration, and despair. Rioting, along with affirmative action programs and busing, generated a white backlash.

**Native-Born Ethnics.** Mexican Americans had similar grievances to those of black Americans. In the 1960s, they began to organize to demand equal rights and equal access to the advantages of American society. Like the black movement, Chicanos stressed cultural pride and demanded citizenship rights. Also like the black movement, the Chicano movement gave rise to nationalist and separatist groups. The most influential Chicano leader, however, was the more mainstream Cesar Chavez, who concentrated on organizing migrant farm workers in California. Native Americans also mobilized and called for Red Power and a revival of tribal customs. AIM demanded the return of lands illegally taken from their ancestors. A resurgence of cultural pride also took place among Polish-Americans, Italian-Americans, and other groups of what had been called "new immigrants."

**Rethinking Public Education.** After World War II, and particularly after the Soviet Union launched *Sputnik*, progressive theories of education, which stressed a "child-centered" approach and "adjustment" over traditional subjects, came increasingly under attack. Critics noted that the system produced poor work habits, fuzzy thinking, and plain ignorance. James B. Conant's *The American High School Today*, a critical look at progressive education, sold nearly half a million copies. Demand for greater academic training and skills, along with the baby boom, caused an explosion of enrollments at American colleges, universities, and junior colleges.

**Students in Revolt.** Students in the 1960s became less and less tolerant of the failure of government to regulate the economy in the general interest and to protect the civil rights of all citizens. The persistence of racism and of poverty in the richest country in the world seemed immoral. Hard-line anticommunism, in the age of atomic weapons, seemed suicidal. Such sentiments drew students to SDS, the goals of which were set forth in its Port Huron Statement of 1962. Controversy over political organizing on campus gave rise to the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. SDS and black students at Columbia occupied university buildings in 1968. SDS's influence waned as the 1960s drew to a close. Black students demanded larger black enrollments, more black faculty, and black studies courses.

**The Counterculture.** Some young people, generally known as hippies, rejected the modern world. They found refuge in communes, crash pads, mystical religions, and drugs. Their culture was opposite, or counter, to that of their parents. Although the counterculture was generally apolitical or even anti-political, there were points of juncture with the New Left. Yippies, led by Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, combined elements of both.

**The Sexual Revolution.** Traditional ideas about sexual behavior and the acceptance of the depiction of nudity and sexual acts in words and pictures changed dramatically in the 1960s. Even if the majority of Americans did not alter their beliefs or practices radically, no longer
were their standards accepted as the only valid ones. More efficient methods of birth control (the Pill) and antibiotics that cured venereal disease removed two impediments to sex outside marriage. The Kinsey Report revealed that many Americans engaged in sexual practices that society proscribed. The sexual revolution reduced irrational fears and opened new doors for relations between the sexes. It also was accompanied by a rise in the number of illegitimate births and an increase in instances of sexually transmitted diseases.

**Women's Liberation.** Sexual freedom, women's increasing role in the work force, and the experiences of women in the civil rights movement and New Left gave rise to demands by women for greater equality for themselves. The publication of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* signaled a revival of feminism in the United States. Friedan and other middle class and professional women formed organizations such as NOW. Younger, more radical women rejected NOW's hierarchical structure and its emphasis on lobbying and education. These women employed different techniques, such as consciousness raising, and demanded more radical changes in society. Some radicals advocated raising children in communal centers; others demanded the abolition of marriage as a legal institution; and still others rejected heterosexuality. One of the more radical feminists, Kate Millett, published *Sexual Politics*, which attacked the "institution of patriarchy."

**POINTS FOR MASTERY**

Students should be able to explain:

1. The factors leading to the demographic shift to the South and West.
2. The impact of television on politics.
3. The factors leading to the baby boom.
4. The interaction between social and political issues and religion.
5. How the social and intellectual changes of the postwar era were reflected in art and literature.
6. What the text means when it argues that "progress was often self-defeating."
7. The negative consequences of the booming economy of the 1960s.
8. The manifestations of growing black impatience with the pace of racial change.
9. The emergence of groups fighting for equality for Hispanics and Native Americans.
10. The critique of progressive education.
11. The factors leading to the student revolt of the 1960s.
12. The distinction between political radicalism and the counterculture.

13. The factors leading to the breakdown of traditional sexual mores.

14. The causes and the course of the feminist revival.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. What were the goals of the women's movement, the Chicano movement, the American Indian Movement, and the civil rights movement? Did they accomplish their respective goals?

2. Discuss the concept of affirmative action. What is the reasoning behind it? Does it result in reverse discrimination?

3. As the text observes, social change can have unintended and unexpected results. For many years after state and private universities opened their doors to blacks, traditionally black colleges suffered declining enrollments. Opening doors to women in the professions and in business eliminated a pool of underpaid but talented teachers in public schools who had few other career options. What are some other unintended results of social changes that took place in the 1960s?

4. What was new about the New Left?

5. Contrast the goals of NOW and those of more radical feminists.

6. The text notes that the counterculture was so deliberately and consciously opposed to the culture of mainstream America that it was, in effect, still dominated by the culture that it rejected. One might add that the counterculture's lifestyle and rejection of materialism were made possible by the affluence of American society in the 1960s. What do these observations indicate about the counterculture? About American society?

7. The “Debating the Past” section discusses conflicting analyses of mass culture and its consequences. What might explain the interest of younger historians in mass culture and their appreciation of it?

8. Is there any correlation between states permitting or restricting abortion in 1973 and the incidence of abortions in 2000 (see the “Mapping the Past” section)? What conclusions might one draw?
LECTURE SUPPLEMENTS

The New Left

The text discusses the student movement, but some teachers may wish to develop the ideology and thought of the New Left more fully.

The New Left began before Vietnam began to arouse great dissent. It was born in the wake of the nuclear confrontation over Berlin and an invasion of Cuba as well as the tumult of the civil rights movement of the early 1960s. The New Left was not especially prescient on Vietnam; it turned its attention to the war relatively late. However, the war was a galvanizing influence. The immediate threat of the draft mobilized student interest. Antiwar protests provided a vehicle for the dissemination of radical ideas. Students at antiwar rallies were exposed to radical ideas.

The New Left was not so much a coherent ideology as it was a powerful critique of two older ideologies, American liberalism and the old left. The New Left challenged liberalism for failing to produce economic justice and attacked the old left for failing to defend the liberty of the individual against the state.

This dual critique presented a problem; there was a contradiction at the core of it. Any government strong enough to redistribute wealth inherently would have great power. It would exercise enormous power over those from whom it took and over those to whom it gave. By taxing wealthier people, the government would deny them the liberty to spend their money as they saw fit. Just as important, the government would have great power over those who received (and were dependent on) the largess of the government. The New Left never adequately resolved that contradiction. One answer proposed, however, was decentralization, or participatory democracy.

If the New Left did not resolve that contradiction, its dual critique of liberalism and the old left contained considerable force.


Radical Feminism of the Sixties and Beyond

As the text discusses, women continued to leave their homes to take jobs in the years after World War II. They expanded the sphere of women's economic activities, but the dominant ideology remained hostile to women, particularly married women who worked. The contradiction between the reality of many women's lives and socially prescribed norms
set the stage for a revival of feminism. The keynote of the feminist revival was the
publication of Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963). Friedan charged that, since
World War II, women had been victimized by a set of ideas she called the "feminine
mystique." She observed a growing dissatisfaction with the definition of women as wives and
mothers and called it "the problem that has no name."

In 1965, Betty Friedan and others formed the National Organization for Women
(NOW), a group of primarily well-educated and professional women. NOW was reformist in
approach; it assumed that the social structure could be changed from within through
legislation and education. A group of academic and professional women formed Women's
Equity Action League (WEAL) in 1968. WEAL focused its attention on issues such as
ending discrimination in employment, education, and taxation.

Other women, younger and more radical, argued that revolutionary changes were
necessary to end sexual inequality. Many of these women had backgrounds in the civil rights
movement. They were made aware of their own inferior status, even within the movement,
by the sexism of their colleagues in SNCC and SDS.

Kate Millett argued in *Sexual Politics* (1969) that "every avenue of power within the
society is entirely in male hands." She described this monopoly of power as patriarchy.
Millett concluded that women could be free only when traditional patterns of marriage and
family were replaced by communal arrangements.

Shulamith Firestone, in *Dialectic of Sex* (1970), called for a society in which gender,
class, and family would play no role. She demanded that women be freed from "the tyranny
of their reproductive biology by every means available." Only with the end of their function
as child-bearers would women be free.

Some activists espoused lesbianism as the most liberated and appropriate form of
sexuality for women. Roxanne Dunbar advocated masturbation over the tyranny of
heterosexuality.

In spite of the clear divisions within the women's movement, they, unlike the civil
rights movement, could still agree on a core of demands into the early 1970s: an end to
discrimination in employment, reform of abortion laws, child-care centers, rejection of
stereotypes of women as sex objects.

As time passed, however, divisions within the movement came to the fore. Today,
feminism takes a variety of forms. Feminists disagree, for example, over the proper response
to pornography. Some think that it should be censored because it denies the civil rights of
women; others defend the right of free expression, no matter how offensive.

By the 1980s, some feminist activists rejected positions they had adopted in the
1960s. Germaine Greer, in *The Female Eunuch* (1970), contended that "if women are to
effect a significant amelioration in their condition it seems obvious that they must refuse to
marry." Instead, she argued, they should be "deliberately promiscuous" but not conceive
babies. However, fourteen years later, in *Sex and Destiny*, she rejected the "ideology of sexual
freedom," lamented the breakup of the family, and even argued that the export of
contraception to the Third World was "evil." Andrea Dworkin, the founder of Women
Against Pornography, stated that "women who have lived through the sexual revolution have
a lot of remorse. They got hurt badly. Sexual liberation only made life harder for women.
They got used. They got abused. They got raped."
Leonore Weitzman conducted a study, published in 1985, in which she maintained that men benefited from no-fault divorce laws (which many states passed in response to pressure from the women's movement) and that women and children suffered. Richard Peterson reworked Weitzman's numbers in 1996 and challenged her figures, but not the basic thrust of her argument. He argued that women experienced a decline in income, after no fault divorce, but a less severe one than Weitzman contended. Similarly, men enjoyed a smaller increase in income but an increase nonetheless.

Women began to play a larger role in politics in the 1980s, but that role was not necessarily radical, or even liberal. NOW remained wedded to the Democratic party, but Jeane Kirkpatrick, Elizabeth Dole, Sandra Day O'Connor, Paula Hawkins, and Nancy Kassenbaum were all Republican.

Evidence of bitter divisions within the feminist camp emerged in the 1980s. Some feminists, such as Ruth Bader Ginsburg, whom Bill Clinton appointed to the Supreme Court, argued for equal treatment and gender-neutral laws. Others, such as Catharine MacKinnon, a professor of law, demanded compensatory legislation. Women disagreed on issues such as the censorship of pornography (see the documents section of Chapter 33 of the Instructor's Manual). MacKinnon and Dworkin favored it; Nadine Strossen, President of the American Civil Liberties Union, opposed it. The divisions became public in a law-suit filed by the EEOC against Sears for discriminating against women. Feminist historians testified for both sides. Alice Kessler Harris appeared as a witness against Sears; Rosiland Rosenberg testified for Sears. A group of feminist historians savagely attacked Rosenberg in professional journals.

In the 1990s, what had become orthodox feminist perspectives and policies came under attack from some women who nonetheless considered themselves feminists. Karen Lehrman argued that orthodox feminist ideas had been "exposed as out of touch with the attitudes of many—in fact most—women." She pointed out that writers such as Camille Paglia, Jean Bethke Elshtain, and Wendy Kaminer criticized the movement's increasing "inclination toward what they saw as puritanism, ideological litmus tests, and victim-oriented rhetoric and policies." Naomi Wolf, the author of The Beauty Myth, which indicted males for using "images of female beauty as a political weapon against women's empowerment," wrote from a different perspective in Fire with Fire (1993). In the latter book, she criticized what was described as "victim feminism" for saddling women with an "identity of powerlessness." She attacked what she regarded as orthodox feminism's bias against sex, wealth, beauty, power, and men. Her indictment included an attack on what she called "insider" feminism" for its "tyranny of the group perspective."

Whatever divisions and disputes have emerged over specific issues in subsequent years, the feminist revival of the late 1960s and early 1970s left a legacy of a concern for equal opportunity that has become an enduring feature of American society.
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Intellectuals in the post-war era worried almost obsessively about the impact of mass society. They had witnessed the rise of two horrifying totalitarian societies (Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union), which led them to contemplate the tyranny of the mass over the individual. The specter of totalitarianism provided a backdrop for virtually all intellectual endeavor during the decade and a half after World War II. Some intellectuals saw in McCarthy the possibility of a totalitarian dictatorship emerging in the United States. Others were more concerned that pressures to conform, amplified by the mass media, could produce a totalitarian society without a political dictatorship. The American people, they warned, might not need a Hitler or a Stalin (or even a McCarthy) to impose totalitarianism; Americans might do it to themselves voluntarily.

Two of the most impressive sociological observations of the period were David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd*, published in 1950, and C. Wright Mills's *White Collar*. Riesman postulated a fundamental transformation of the American character. He argued that the typical American had historically been "inner-directed." That is, he or she took cues on how to behave from an internal set of values, established early in life by instruction from family, church, and community. "Inner-directed" personalities, Riesman contended, were giving way to what he called "other-directed" people, whose values were shaped by the expectations and evaluations of peers and the mass media.

Mills regarded American business as oppressive and argued that the new white-collar workers constituted a new lumpenproletariat.


Questions for Discussion

1. In what ways are the critiques of Riesman and Mills similar? How do these similarities relate to the larger concern about totalitarianism?

2. Were Mills and Riesman correct about the impact of mass culture? In subsequent years, were their fears born out? If so, how? If not, how not?
3. In what ways do the images from Portfolio Four indicate the first of the "Two Dilemmas" the text poses? In what ways do those images illustrate the "Costs of Prosperity" discussed in the text? What costs are associated with preserving wildlands? What costs are associated with failing to preserve them?
David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd* (1950)

...If we wanted to cast our social character types into social class molds, we could say that inner-direction is the typical character of the "old" middle class—the banker, the tradesman, the small entrepreneur, the technically oriented engineer, etc.—while other-direction is becoming the typical character of the "new" middle class—the bureaucrat, the salaried employee in business, etc....There is a decline in the numbers and in the proportion of the working population engaged in production and extraction...and an increase in the numbers and proportion engaged in white-collar work and the service trades.

...Increasingly, relations with the outer world and with oneself are mediated by the flow of mass communication....

These developments lead, for large numbers of people, to changes in paths to success and to the requirement of more "socialized" behavior for both success and for marital and personal adaptation....Under these newer patterns the peer-group (the age- and class-graded group in a child's school and neighborhood) becomes much more important to the child, while the parents make him feel guilty not so much about violation of inner standards as about failure to be popular or otherwise to manage his relations with these other children. Moreover, the pressure of the school and the peer-group are reinforced and continued...by the mass media: movies, radio, comics, and popular culture media generally. Under these conditions types of character emerge that we shall call other-directed....What is common to all other-directeds is that their contemporaries are the source of direction for the individual—either those known to him or those with whom he is indirectly acquainted, through friends and through the mass media. This source is of course 'internalized" in the sense that dependence on it for guidance in life is implanted early. The goals toward which the other-directed person strives shift with that guidance: it is only the process of striving itself and the process of paying close attention to the signals from others that remain unaltered throughout life....

...While all people want and need to be liked by some of the people some of the time, it is only the modern other-directed types who make this their chief source of direction and chief area of sensitivity....
...The troubles that confront the white-collar people are the troubles of all men and women living in the twentieth century. If these troubles seem particularly bitter to the new middle strata, perhaps that is because for a brief time these people felt themselves immune to trouble.

Before the First World War there were fewer little men, and in their brief monopoly of high-school education they were in fact protected from many of the sharper edges of the workings of capitalistic progress. They were free to entertain deep illusions about their individual abilities and about the collective trustworthiness of the system. As their number has grown, however, they have become increasingly subject to wage-worker conditions. Especially since the Great Depression have white-collar people come up against all the old problems of capitalist society. They have been racked by slump and war and even by boom. They have learned about impersonal employment in depression and about impersonal death by technological violence in war. And in good times, as prices rose faster than salaries, the money they thought they were making was silently taken away from them.

The material hardship of nineteenth-century industrial workers finds its parallel on the psychological level among twentieth-century white-collar employees. The new Little Man seems to have no firm roots, no sure loyalties to sustain his life and give it a center....

The uneasiness, the malaise of our time, is due to this root fact: in our politics and economy, in family life and religion—in practically every sphere of our existence—the certainties of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries have disintegrated or been destroyed and, at the same time, no new sanctions or justifications for the new routines we live, and must live, have taken hold....Among white-collar people, the malaise is deep-rooted; for the absence of any order of belief has left them morally defenseless as individuals and politically impotent as a group....This isolated position makes him excellent material for synthetic molding at the hands of popular culture—print, film, radio, and television....

In the case of the white-collar man, the alienation of the wage-worker from the products of his work is carried one step nearer to its Kafka-like completion. The salaried employee does not make anything, although he may handle much that he greatly desires but cannot have. No product of craftsmanship can be his to contemplate with pleasure as it is being created and after it is made. Being alienated from any product of his labor, and going year after year through the same paper routine, he turns his leisure all the more frenziedly to the ersatz diversion that is sold him, and partakes of the synthetic excitement that neither eases nor releases. He is bored at work and restless at play, and this terrible alternation wears him out....

When white-collar people get jobs, they sell not only their time and energy but their personalities as well. They sell by the week or month their smiles and their kindly gestures, and they must practice the prompt repression of resentment and aggression.
The civil rights movement adopted nonviolent direct action as a means of gaining integration. As the sixties progressed, however, some blacks began to question not only the tactic of nonviolent direct action but the goal of integration itself. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which grew out of the sit-ins, was committed to nonviolence. In the early 1960s, SNCC turned its attention to voter registration drives in the Deep South. There they met with entrenched and violent resistance, which convinced some that nonviolence would not work. Many in SNCC had adopted nonviolence as an effective tool; they did not share the deep moral and religious commitment to it held by Martin Luther King, Jr., James Lawson, John Lewis, and others. SNCC field workers also began to question the goal of integration.

The first document is SNCC's Statement of Purpose, which was adopted by a conference held at Shaw University in April 1960. The statement was adopted at the insistence of James Lawson, a former theology student at Vanderbilt University and one of the leaders of the Nashville student movement.

The second document is from the speech John Lewis, chairman of SNCC, prepared to give at the March on Washington in 1963. By this time, SNCC was thoroughly disillusioned with the Kennedy administration, which had demonstrated only lukewarm support for civil rights and had failed to protect civil rights workers in the South. Lewis's speech reflected some of the anger and disillusion of SNCC. A group of civil rights leaders, including King, Ralph Abernathy, Bayard Rustin, and A. Philip Randolph, persuaded Lewis to modify the speech. The real irony was not that Lewis delivered a toned-down version of his speech, but that even Lewis's original draft did not represent the dominant sensibility of SNCC. Lewis's emphasis on nonviolence and his religious orientation (Lewis had been a student at the American Baptist Theological Seminary) were out of step with a growing number of people within SNCC.

The third document is from Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton, Black Power (1967). Carmichael became chairman of SNCC in 1966. In this passage, he rejects not only the tactics of nonviolence, but the goal of integration as well.

Questions for Discussion

1. In what way were the tactics of the participants in the sit-ins and of the founders of SNCC particularly appropriate to their goals? In what way did Carmichael's different tactics relate to his different goals?

2. Compare Lewis's speech with the SNCC's Statement of Purpose. What changes in tone do you observe? Does the change in tone represent any change in basic tactics or goals?

3. What in Lewis's speech do you think so disturbed other civil rights leaders? Why do you think they wanted Lewis to soften his speech?

4. Discuss the changes in attitude from SNCC's Statement of Purpose to Carmichael's Black Power. What might account for those changes?
We affirm the philosophical or religious ideal of nonviolence as the foundation of our purpose, the presupposition of our faith, and the manner of our action. Nonviolence as it grows from Judaic-Christian tradition seeks a social order of justice permeated by love. Integration of human endeavor represents the crucial first step toward such a society.

Through nonviolence, courage displaces fear; love transforms hate. Acceptance dissipates prejudice; hope ends despair. Peace dominates war; faith reconciles doubt. Mutual regard cancels enmity. Justice for all overthrows injustice. The redemptive community supercedes systems of gross social immorality.

Love is the central motif of nonviolence. Love is the force by which God binds man to Himself and man to man. Such love goes to the extreme; it remains loving and forgiving even in the midst of hostility. It matches the capacity of evil to inflict suffering with an even more enduring capacity to absorb evil, all the while persisting in love.

By appealing to conscience and standing on the moral nature of human existence, nonviolence nurtures the atmosphere in which reconciliation and justice become actual possibilities.
John Lewis, "Address at the March on Washington" (1963)

We march today for jobs and freedom, but we have nothing to be proud of, for hundreds and thousands of our brothers are not here—they have no money for their transportation, for they are receiving starvation wages...or no wages, at all.

In good conscience, we cannot support the Administration's civil rights bill, for it is too little, and too late. There's not one thing in the bill that will protect our people from police brutality.

The voting section of the bill will not help the thousands of citizens who want to vote....

What is in the bill that will protect the homeless and starving people of this nation? What is there in this bill to insure the equality of a maid who earns $5.00 a week in the home of a family whose income is $100,000 a year?

The bill will not protect young children and old women from police dogs and fire hoses for engaging in peaceful demonstrations....

For the first time in 100 years this nation is being awakened to the fact that segregation is evil and it must be destroyed in all forms. Our presence today proves that we have been aroused to the point of action.

We are now involved in a serious revolution. This nation is still a place of cheap political leaders who build their careers on immoral compromise and ally themselves with open forms of political, economic and social exploitation....The party of Kennedy is also the party of Eastland. The party of Javits is also the party of Goldwater. Where is our party?

I want to know—which side is the federal government on?

The revolution is at hand, and we must free ourselves of the chains of political and economic slavery. The non-violent revolution is saying, "We will not wait for the courts to act, for we have been waiting hundreds of years. We will not wait for the President, nor the Justice Department, nor Congress, but we will take matters into our own hands, and create a great source of power, outside of any national structure that could and would assure us victory."...We cannot be patient, we do not want to be free gradually, we want our freedom, and we want it now. We can not depend on any political party, for both the Democrats and Republicans have betrayed the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence....

The revolution is a serious one. Mr. Kennedy is trying to take the revolution out of the streets and put it in the courts. Listen, Mr. Kennedy, listen. Mr. Congressman, listen, fellow citizens—the black masses are on the march for jobs and freedom, and we must say to the politicians that there won't be a "cooling-off period."

We won't stop now. All of the forces of Eastland, Barnett and Wallace won't stop this revolution. The next time we march, we won't march on Washington, but will march through the South, through the Heart of Dixie, the way Sherman did—nonviolently. We will make the action of the past few months look petty. And I say to you, WAKE UP AMERICA!
The advocates of Black Power reject the old slogans and meaningless rhetoric of previous years in the civil rights struggle. The language of yesterday is indeed irrelevant: progress, non-violence, integration, fear of "white backlash," coalition....

One of the tragedies of the struggle against racism is that up to this point there has been no national organization which could speak to the growing militancy of young black people in the urban ghettos and the black-belt South. There has been only a "civil rights" movement, whose tone of voice was adapted to an audience of middle class whites. It served as a sort of buffer zone between that audience and angry young blacks. It claimed to speak for the needs of a community, but it did not speak in the tone of that community. None of its so-called leaders could go into a rioting community and be listened to. In a sense, the blame must be shared—along with the mass media—by those leaders for what happened in Watts, Harlem, Chicago, Cleveland and other places. Each time the black people in those cities saw Dr. Martin Luther King get slapped they became angry. When they saw little black girls bombed to death in a church and civil rights workers ambushed and murdered, they were angrier; and when nothing happened, they were steaming mad. We had nothing to offer that they could see, except to go out and be beaten again. We helped to build their frustration.

We had only the old language of love and suffering. And in most places—that is, from the liberals and middle class—we got back the old language of patience and progress....

Such language, along with admonitions to remain non-violent and fear the white backlash, convinced some that that course was the only course to follow. It misled some into believing that a black minority could bow its head and get whipped into a meaningful position of power. The very notion is absurd....

There are many who still sincerely believe in that approach. From our viewpoint, rampaging white mobs and white night-riders must be made to understand that their days of free head-whipping are over. Black people should and must fight back. Nothing more quickly repels someone bent on destroying you than the unequivocal message: "O.K., fool, make your move, and run the same risk I run—of dying."

Next we deal with the term "integration." According to its advocates, social justice will be accomplished by "integrating the Negro into the mainstream institutions of the society from which he has been traditionally excluded." This concept is based on the assumption that there is nothing of value in the black community and that little of value could be created among black people. The thing to do is to siphon off the "acceptable" black people into the surrounding middle class white community.

The goals of integrationists are middle class goals, articulated primarily by a small group of Negroes with middle class aspirations or status....

Secondly, while color blindness may be a sound goal ultimately, we must realize that race is an overwhelming fact of life in this historical period. There is no black man in the country who can live "simply as a man." His blackness is an ever-present fact of this racist society, whether he recognizes it or not. It is unlikely that this or the next generation will witness the time when race will no longer be relevant in the conduct of public affairs and in public policy decision-making....
"Integration" as a goal today speaks to the problem of blackness not only in an unrealistic way but also in a despicable way. It is based on complete acceptance of the fact that in order to have a decent house or education, black people must move into a white neighborhood or send their children to a white school. This reinforces, among both black and white, the idea that "white" is automatically superior and "black" is by definition inferior. For this reason, "integration" is a subterfuge for the maintenance of white supremacy.
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The first document, the Port Huron Statement, was written primarily by Tom Hayden and adopted by SDS at its national convention in Port Huron, Michigan, in 1962. The second document is from an article by Sol Stern, a participant in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley.

George F. Kennan, a distinguished scholar and observer of the Soviet Union, was one of the architects of the policy of containment. The third document is an excerpt from a speech Kennan gave at Swarthmore College in December 1967, which was later reprinted in the New York Times Magazine. In response to its publication, letters poured in to the Times and to Kennan. He published the speech, a selection of letters, and his response in a book published in 1968.

These documents offer different perspectives on the student revolt. The Port Huron Statement is a statement of political ideology, drafted by leaders of the movement. Stern's article indicates the deep alienation some students felt from the new, large, and impersonal state universities. Kennan's speech reveals much about how liberal professors regarded student radicals.


Questions for Discussion

1. Which of these perspectives most closely resembles that found in the text? Why might that be the case?

2. Does anything in either the Port Huron Statement or Stern's article bear out Kennan's charges? If so, which ones and how?

3. What issues dominate the Port Huron Statement? Stern's article?

4. The alienation Stern expressed is not uncommon in large state universities. It does not often lead to the kind of confrontation that took place at Berkeley in 1964-1965. What else might account for the timing of the Free Speech Movement?
The Port Huron Statement (1962)

We are the people of this generation, bred in at least modest comfort, housed now in the universities, looking uncomfortably to the world we inherit.

When we were kids the United States was the wealthiest and strongest country in the world; the only one with the atom bomb, the least scarred by modern war, an initiator of the United Nations that we thought would distribute Western influence throughout the world. Freedom and equality for each individual, government of, by, and for the people—these American values we found good, principles by which we could live as men. Many of us began maturing in complacency.

As we grew, however, our comfort was penetrated by events too troubling to dismiss. First, the permeating and victimizing fact of human degradation, symbolized by the Southern struggle against racial bigotry, compelled most of us from silence to activism. Second, the enclosing fact of the Cold War, symbolized by the presence of the Bomb, brought awareness that we ourselves, and our friends, and millions of abstract "others" we knew more directly because of our common peril, might die at any time. We might deliberately ignore, or avoid or fail to feel all other human problems, but not these two, for these were too immediate and crushing in their impact, too challenging in the demand that we as individuals take the responsibility for encounter and resolution.
Sol Stern, "A Deeper Disenchantment" (1965)

The University of California is probably the most impressive and prestigious state university in the country. It boasts a world-famous faculty that included a half dozen Nobel Prize winners and its many departments are all considered "first rate." It is the "compleat" university. There is something there for everyone: a sprawling, pleasant campus, top-notch recreational facilities (including an outdoor country-club and swimming pool nestled in the Berkeley hills), a huge library, and excellent medical facilities. A constant flow of illustrious and exciting speakers and performers appear on the campus...The resident student gets all this, plus his education for approximately one hundred dollars a semester....

Despite all the academic glitter and the bountiful social life Berkeley offers, there is deep and bitter resentment among many students about their life at the University. It is a resentment that starts from the contradiction between the public image and reputation of the University and their actual day-to-day experiences as students. For these students recognize that all that is exciting and stimulating about Berkeley comes from the frills and extras of university life; the formal university-learning experience is generally a deadening one.

The new undergraduate learns quickly that of all the functions of the Great University his own education is perhaps the least important. He has almost no contact with the famous professors he has heard about. They, for their part, seek ways to escape the "burden" of teaching to be able to devote full time to the pursuit of their professions (which are not defined to include teaching). Graduate teaching assistants do most of whatever face-to-face teaching the undergraduate encounters....

[I]t must not be forgotten that behind the facade of orderly and pleasant campuses there are deep currents of unrest and dissatisfaction. White, middle-class students in the North also need a liberation movement, for they have no community in which they exercise citizenship. They feel imprisoned and oppressed by a smiling and genial bureaucracy.

The issues at Berkeley are deeper than civil rights and civil liberties. These issues merely provided the form of this first serious revolt against modern liberal bureaucracy....It is this that concerns the students at Berkeley, and in response to that crisis they created an important little wedge against the creeping totalitarianism that threatens all of us.
George F. Kennan, *Democracy and the Student Left* (1968)

There is an ideal that has long been basic to the learning process as we have known it, one that stands at the very center of our modern institutions of higher education and that had its origin, I suppose, in the clerical and monastic character of the medieval university. It is the ideal of the association of the process of learning with a certain remoteness from the contemporary scene—a certain detachment and seclusion, a certain voluntary withdrawal and renunciation of participation in contemporary life in the interests of the achievement of a better perspective on that life when the period of withdrawal is over. It is an ideal that does not predicate any total conflict between thought and action, but recognizes that there is time for each....

There is a dreadful incongruity between this vision and the state of mind—and behavior—of the radical left on the American campus today. In place of a calm science, "recluse, ascetic, like a nun," not knowing or caring that the world passes "if the truth but come in answer to her prayer," we have people utterly absorbed in the affairs of this passing world. And instead of these affairs being discussed with knowledge and without passion, we find them treated with transports of passion and with a minimum, I fear, of knowledge.... In place of self-possession, we have screaming tantrums and brawling in the streets. In place of the "thorough way of talk" that [Woodrow] Wilson envisaged, we have banners and epithets and obscenities and virtually meaningless slogans....

What strikes one first about the angry militancy is the extraordinary degree of certainty by which it is inspired: certainty of one's own rectitude, certainty of the accuracy and profundity of one's own analysis of the problems of contemporary society, certainty as to the iniquity of those who disagree. And this being so, one is struck to see such massive certainties already present in the minds of people who not only have not studied very much but presumably are not studying a great deal.... That they are really students, I must be permitted to doubt. I have heard it freely confessed by members of the revolutionary student generation of Tsarist Russia that, proud as they were of the revolutionary exploits of their youth, they never really learned anything in their university years; they were too busy with politics.
CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The Oil Crisis. Following the Arab-Israeli War in October 1973, the Arab oil-producing states cut off oil shipments to the United States and other western countries. The price of oil rose from $3 a barrel to $12. This sent the price of nearly everything skyrocketing. Oil heated homes and powered factories; it was also used by utility plants to generate electricity. Nylon and other synthetic fibers, many plastics, paints, insecticides, and fertilizers were based on petrochemicals. And, of course, crude oil was refined into gasoline to run cars. The Arab oil embargo pushed up prices and created shortages. Kissinger negotiated an agreement that involved the withdrawal of Israel from some of the territory it occupied in 1967. The Arab nations lifted the oil embargo. America, which had once been an oil exporter, no longer produced enough oil for its own use. As gasoline prices in the United States increased, Americans began to turn to smaller, more efficient cars. That hurt the American automobile industry.

Ford as President. After being appointed, rather than elected, vice-president, Gerald Ford assumed the presidency on Nixon's resignation in August of 1974. He seemed unimaginative and less than brilliant, but he was hardworking and untouched by scandal. An open and earnest person, Ford seemed unlikely to venture beyond conventional boundaries. Although this was what the country wanted in the aftermath of the Nixon scandals, Ford proved unable to contend with the powerful forces that would shake the nation's economic foundation. He faced high inflation, as well as high unemployment, and had to deal with Democratic majorities in both houses of Congress. Even recognizing the difficult situation he faced, Ford's handling of the economy was inept.

The Fall of South Vietnam. Congress refused Ford's request for aid to South Vietnam, and Saigon fell to the North Vietnamese in 1975. The long Vietnam War was finally over.

Ford Versus Carter. After some hesitation, Ford decided to seek the Republican presidential nomination in 1976. He narrowly survived a challenge by Ronald Reagan, a former movie actor and former governor of California. Ford's Democratic challenger was Jimmy Carter of Georgia. Carter's homespun appeal and his outsider's image initially gave him a considerable edge over Ford. Both candidates were vague on issues, but Carter patched together key elements of the New Deal coalition and won a narrow victory.

The Carter Presidency. Carter attempted to impart an air of democratic simplicity and a measure of moralism to his presidency. He set aside the formal trappings of office, which made a pleasant change from Nixon. However, Carter filled his administration with Georgia
associates who had as little national political experience as he had. The administration
developed a reputation for submitting complicated proposals and failing to follow them up.

**A National Malaise.** Carter alienated public opinion by making a television address in which
he described a "moral and spiritual crisis" that sapped the nation's energies. Sermons on the
emptiness of consumption rang hollow to those who had lost their jobs or seen inflation
shrink their paychecks. The economic downturn, though triggered by the energy crisis, had
more fundamental causes. The nation's productivity had declined, in part because of
discontent among workers with increasingly dull, repetitive jobs. Younger workers grew
impatient with aging union leaders and a system that tied salary increases to seniority. As a
result, union membership declined.

**Stagflation: The Weird Economy.** Carter confronted an unanticipated and difficult
economic situation. The nation experienced simultaneously high inflation and high
unemployment. The term "stagflation" was coined to describe the seemingly contradictory
combination of high inflation and slow growth. Carter's solutions to the nation's economic
problems closely paralleled those of his Republican predecessors. He advanced an admirable,
if complicated, national energy plan but, typically, failed to press for its implementation.
Congress raised the minimum wage and tied social security payments to the cost of living
index. While this helped the working poor and pensioners, it unbalanced the federal budget
and caused further upward pressure on prices. As incomes rose in response to inflation,
people moved into higher tax brackets. "Bracket creep" and decreased spending power gave
rise to "taxpayer revolts." Deficit spending by the government pushed interest rates higher
and thereby increased the cost of doing business. Soaring mortgage rates made it difficult to
sell homes; the resulting housing slump cost many construction workers their jobs and meant
bankruptcy for many builders. Savings and loan institutions were especially hard hit because
they were saddled with long-term mortgages made when rates were as low as 4 and 5 percent.
Now they had to pay much more than that to hold deposits and offer even higher rates to
attract new money.

**Families Under Stress.** Oil prices nearly tripled in 1979, which touched off another round of
inflation. Auto makers were especially hard hit. Workers, most of them men, lost relatively
high-paying jobs in automobile factories and steel mills. In many cases, their spouses took
lower-paying jobs in restaurants, retail stores, and offices to make up for lost income. Eating
out, especially in fast food restaurants became more common; families with two working
parents had little time to shop for, prepare, and enjoy leisurely meals at the dinner table. The
recession struck just as millions of young women, raised with feminist expectations, were
beginning careers. Nevertheless, well-educated women made significant gains in the 1970s.
As a result, women divided into a professional elite and a poorly paid, struggling class. One
casualty was the Equal Rights Amendment. Although Congress passed the ERA in 1972 and
twenty-two states had ratified it by the end of that year, Phyllis Schlafly headed a campaign
against the ERA. Schlafly's campaign struck a responsive chord with anxious housewives and
women who worked for low wages. The ERA failed to win ratification in the necessary
three-fourths of the states.
Cold War or Détente? Carter's foreign policy suffered from the same indecision and inconsistency as his domestic policy. He announced an intention to place the issue of "basic human rights" before all else. He cut aid to Chile and Argentina because of their human rights violations, but said little about and continued aid to other repressive nations. Carter negotiated for the gradual return of the Panama Canal to Panama's control and a guarantee of the neutrality of the canal. He also attempted to continue Nixon's policy of détente. The president ended American recognition of Taiwan and exchanged ambassadors with the People's Republic of China. His policies toward the Soviets were inconsistent, in part because his secretary of state, Cyrus Vance, supported détente while his national security advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, was strongly anti-Russian. The United States and Soviet Union signed a second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) in 1979, and Carter submitted it to the Senate for ratification. After the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, however, Carter withdrew the treaty from consideration. Carter also stopped the shipment of American grain and high technology to the Soviet Union and boycotted the Moscow Olympics. All of this served effectively to end détente. Carter's major diplomatic achievement was the signing of the Camp David Agreement in 1978 between Egypt and Israel.

The Iran Crisis: Origins. Beginning in World War II, the United States helped maintain the rule of the Shah of Iran, Muhammad Reza Pahlavi. The United States sold weapons to the Shah and trained his secret police. Although Iran was an enthusiastic member of OPEC, the Shah was a firm friend of the United States. Many regarded Iran to be, as Carter put it, "an island of stability" in the Middle East. This appearance was deceptive. The Shah angered conservative Muslims with his attempts to westernize Iranian society. Moreover, his regime brutally suppressed political dissenters. The Shah's opponents hated the United States. In 1978, the Iranian people overthrew the Shah. A revolutionary government headed by the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini took power. When Carter invited the deposed Shah to come to the United States for medical treatment, Iranian radicals stormed the American embassy compound in Teheran and held the Americans inside hostage.

The Iran Crisis: Carter's Dilemma. The militants who seized the embassy demanded the return of the Shah and the surrender of his assets to the Iranian government in exchange for their American captives. Carter refused and froze Iranian assets held in the United States. He also banned trade with Iran until the hostages were released. Carter initially benefited from the American people's willingness to support a president in times of crisis. In April 1980, Carter ordered a military rescue mission. The raid was a fiasco. Several helicopters broke down, and Carter called off the rescue. During a confused departure, a crash killed eight American commandos.

The Election of 1980. Despite his difficulties, Carter won his party's nomination. Ronald Reagan, the former governor of California, ran on the Republican ticket. John Anderson, a liberal Republican from Illinois, ran as an independent. Reagan, a New Deal Democrat turned conservative Republican, promised to decentralize the federal government and to turn over many of its responsibilities to state and local governments. Both Carter and Reagan ran negative campaigns. In the end, Reagan won handily. He polled over 43 million popular
Reagan as President. Reagan demanded reductions in federal spending and the deficit. His calls for cuts in federal programs focused chiefly on social services, which he wanted returned to the states. Reagan eliminated many government regulations on business. In addition, he requested tax cuts to stimulate the economy and generate new jobs. Reagan pursued a hard-line anticommunist foreign policy and engaged in a huge military buildup to meet the threat of the Soviet Union. He installed cruise missiles in Europe, sought to undermine the leftist government of Nicaragua, and attempted to bolster the conservative government of El Salvador. Reagan used American troops to overthrow a Cuban-backed regime on the Caribbean island of Grenada in 1982. He also sent American forces to serve as part of an international peacekeeping force in Lebanon. In October 1983, 239 marines died when a Muslim fanatic crashed a truck loaded with explosives into a building that housed the marines.

Four More Years. In the election of 1984, Reagan faced Walter Mondale of Minnesota, Carter's vice-president. Mondale chose Representative Geraldine Ferraro of New York as his running mate. Mondale hoped that Ferraro, an Italian-American and a Catholic, would appeal to conservative Democratic voters who had supported Reagan in 1980 and that her gender would attract bipartisan support from women. Mondale's strategy failed to translate into votes. Reagan benefited from the advantages of incumbency and the support of the Christian right. Beyond that, he enjoyed a broad base of support including a great number of working people and southerners who had traditionally voted Democrat. Reagan's immense popularity, along with the collapse of the New Deal coalition, resulted in a landslide victory for Reagan.

"The Reagan Revolution." The shape of Reagan's foreign policy changed little at the onset of his second term. He maintained his call for a strategic defense initiative, high defense budgets, and vigorous anticommunist policies. After Mikhail S. Gorbachev became the Soviet premier in March 1985, however, Reagan gradually softened the tone of his anti-Soviet rhetoric. During a series of summits, the two leaders began to break down the hostilities and suspicion that separated their nations. In 1988, the two superpowers signed a treaty eliminating medium-range nuclear missiles. Congress balked at the cost of Star Wars. The explosion of the Challenger cast doubt on the idea of basing the national defense on the complex technology involved in controlling machines in outer space.

In domestic affairs, Reagan engineered massive tax cuts, culminating in the passage of the Income Tax Act of 1986. The new tax structure did not prevent the gap between rich and poor from widening. The president effected a shift in the federal judiciary through his appointment of conservative judges, including Sandra Day O'Connor, the first woman to serve on the Supreme Court.

Change and Uncertainty. The Reagan years witnessed a wave of legal and illegal immigration. The new immigrants of the 1970s and 1980s were primarily Hispanics and
Asians. The nation's population aged as the baby boomers matured, creating new demands on health-care and social services. The traditional family seemed threatened with ceasing to be the norm. Increasing numbers of families were headed by single parents; over a million marriages a year ended in divorce; couples lived together without getting married; the number of illegitimate births rose steadily.

AIDS. During the 1980s, the nation confronted its most serious health crisis in decades. In the early 1980s, scientists identified acquired immune-deficiency syndrome (AIDS), a disease caused by the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), which destroyed the body's defenses against infection. The disease spread when an infected person's bodily fluids came into contact with another person's. HIV soon infected the nation's blood banks. The government responded slowly. A nationwide campaign urged "safe" sex, particularly the use of condoms.

The Merger Movement. Across the nation in the 1980s there was a movement toward concentration in business. "Corporate raiders" raised cash by issuing high-interest bonds secured by the assets of the companies they purchased. Twenty percent of the Fortune 500 companies were taken over, merged, or forced to go private. Some companies took steps to make themselves less tempting to raiders by acquiring large debts or unprofitable companies. Service on debt consumed half of the pre-tax earnings of the nation's corporations.

"A Job for Life:" Layoffs Hit Home. Corporations coped with debt in two ways; they sold assets or they cut costs, usually through layoffs. IBM, the unofficial slogan of which had been "a job for life," eliminated more than a third of its workforce, 80,000 jobs, between 1985 and 1994. Corporations took jobs abroad, where labor costs were lower.

Of even greater significance than the growing corporate debt was the debt of the federal government. Reagan's policies of tax cuts and increased military spending produced huge annual federal deficits. When Reagan took office, the federal debt was $900 million; eight years later, it exceeded $2.5 trillion.

A "Bi-Polar" Economy, a Fractured Society. In spite of the corporate and governmental debt, the economy began to gain strength in 1982, and by the late 1980s was growing at a rate unparalleled since the 1960s. Prices declined, even though the volume of business was growing. The stock market soared. Many economists considered the run-up of stock prices excessive, and their misgivings were seemingly confirmed when the Dow-Jones industrial average fell 508 points on a single day in 1987. However, stock prices quickly recovered and embarked on another period of dramatic growth. The economy was undergoing a fundamental transformation. Even as the manufacturing industries of the "rust belt" declined, new industries based on technology sprung up in places like the "Silicon Valley" of California. By the end of the Reagan years, job opportunities and wages were declining in traditional heavy industry; although the older corporations that survived the shake-out were more competitive in the global market. High-tech and service industries provided opportunities for entrepreneurs. American society was becoming increasingly polarized as well. Both the changing economy and governmental policy benefitted the affluent disproportionately and hit the unskilled or semi-skilled the hardest.
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The Iran-Contra Arms Deal. The public seemed willing to credit the Reagan administration for the nation's successes and absolve it of the nation's failures. Two initiatives in foreign policy, however, seriously hampered the effectiveness of the administration. In 1984, Congress forbade the expenditure of federal funds to aid the Nicaraguan contras. In the Middle East, Iran and Iraq had been engaged in a bloody war since 1980. Further, many blamed Iran for the holding of a number of Americans hostage by terrorists in Lebanon. Reagan opposed bargaining with terrorists, but he wanted to find a way to free the hostages. During 1985, he made a decision to allow the indirect shipment of arms to Iran by way of Israel. When this failed to work, he authorized the secret sale of American weapons directly to Iranians. Marine Colonel Oliver North, an aide to the president's national security advisor, Admiral John Poindexter, devised a plan to supply the Contras without directly using federal funds. He used profits from the arms sales to Iran to provide weapons for the contras. Disclosure of this "deal" led to Senate hearings, court trials, and the resignations of many involved. Although he remained personally popular, Reagan's influence with Congress and his reputation as a leader plummeted.

Reagan's success derived from his ability to articulate, simply and persuasively, a handful of concepts, including the evil nature of the Soviet Union and the need to get government off people's backs. In doing so, he created a climate conducive to political change.

POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:


2. The problems facing Ford as president.

3. The factors leading to Carter's victory in 1976.

4. The ways in which Carter undermined his own presidency.

5. Carter's successes and failures in foreign affairs.

6. The sources and results of the inflation of the late 1970s.

7. United States-Iranian relations leading up to the hostage crisis.

8. The impact of the hostage crisis in Iran on American domestic politics.


10. Reagan's economic policies.

12. The changing relations between the United States and the Soviet Union under Reagan and Gorbachev.


14. The major social and demographic trends of the 1980s.

15. The AIDS crisis.

16. The causes and consequences of the merger movement.

17. The fundamental changes that altered the economy.

18. The Iran-Contra Scandal.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. Under Carter, high interest rates crippled small businesses, which need to borrow money to function. Costs of borrowing money can be passed on to consumers only to a point. Past that point, customers stop purchasing. If the cost of doing business continues to increase, it eats into profits until it becomes unprofitable to do business. Small businesses account for roughly two-thirds of the new jobs created by the economy in the last several decades. What impact did Carter's economic policies have on long-term job creation?

2. The savings and loan crisis had its origins in the 1970s. Some of the industry's problems came about because of changes in the industry itself. The policies of Carter and Reagan, however, contributed significantly to the crisis. The high interest rates of the Carter years made it impossible for savings and loan institutions to attract money, since they were restricted to paying 5 percent interest on savings accounts. Moreover, the savings and loans held mortgages at 4 and 5 percent but had to pay much higher rates themselves. Then the Reagan administration lifted regulations on the savings and loans. What was the likely response of a weak institution to the lifting of regulations? What would be the likely long-term consequences? Risks?

3. What was the economic legacy of the 1980s?

4. The text notes that "the Reagan administration was generally credited with the nation's successes and absolved of its failures." The text, on the other hand, blames the Reagan administration for many of the nation's economic problems and gives it none of the credit for the economic boom of the 1980s. To what extent did Reagan deserve credit or blame for the nation's economic performance? To what extent, generally, do presidents take
too much credit for good economic times and receive too much blame for economic downturns?

5. The text describes Reagan’s reduction of taxes as a “scheme,” a word with negative connotations. However, John F. Kennedy recommended similar tax cuts in 1963, which were widely approved by liberal economists at the time and have been subsequently praised by liberal historians. What, if any, differences were there between Kennedy’s tax cuts and Reagan’s?

6. Consult the “Debating the Past” section and the material relating to Reagan’s foreign policy in this chapter. What role did the Reagan administration play in the fall of the Soviet Union?

7. In what ways does the career of Bill Gates (See the American Lives section) illustrate changes described in the section titled "A 'Bi-Polar' Economy, a Fractured Society"?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

As the 1970s progressed, American liberals faced new and serious challenges. The population had begun to age. People abandoned the old industrial centers of the North and East for the South and West, stripping the older centers of their tax bases. Infrastructures began to decay. Jobs changed; older industries declined. American productivity lagged. Americans were fed up with regulation, which increasingly appeared to be creeping tyranny. It became more and more clear that not all regulation served the public interest. Americans rebelled against what political scientist Alpheus Mason called the "imperial bureaucracy." More and more people became convinced that bureaucracy was wasteful, incompetent, insensitive, and unresponsive.

Traditional liberals failed to respond to the challenges of the 1970s and 1980s. Old-style federal programs offered no way to handle inflation. Nor did they offer any solution to the energy crisis. The theory of abundance undergirded every Democratic (and, for that matter, Republican) administration since World War II. At the end of the 1970s, however, people began to ask what if the pie could not continue to grow. Economists did not have the tools to achieve non-inflationary growth.

Since the end of the New Deal, government had relied on federal programs as the linchpins of domestic consensus. By the late 1970s, however, such programs fell out of favor with both the left and right. Many began to question whether federal intervention was the best way to handle problems. More fundamentally, people began to question whether spending money on problems could solve them. The fact was that the programs of the 1960s did not always work. Some received inadequate funding. Some were poorly managed; others were ill conceived. Some confronted problems so intractable that they could make no impact.

By the mid-seventies, both left and right questioned the Great Society's approach of throwing money at problems. Critics on both sides began to talk about balanced budgets and cutting wasteful spending. In this environment, a new breed of Democrats began to emerge.

These Democrats, many of whom won election for the first time in the post-Watergate elections of the mid-seventies, began to speak of fiscal restraint and hard choices. Everything might be worth doing, they argued; but, in an era of limited resources, priorities needed to be established. Hard choices had to be made.

In one sense, neo-liberal Democrats such as Bill Bradley, Gary Hart, Richard Lamm, Bruce Babbitt, and Paul Tsongas might have sounded like Republicans. In many ways, however, they were different. They wanted not so much to change the goals of their party as to change the means of achieving them. They recognized, in the words of neo-liberal journalist Charles Peters, that "there are a lot of things wrong with a lot of the Big Government solutions we tried, but there was never anything wrong with the ends we were seeking."

Neo-liberals rejected the interest group politics of the 1930s. Rather, they believed in a discernable national interest and in pursuing it. Moreover, neo-liberals stressed the integrated nature of the world economy. Along these lines, they rejected protectionism, which made them unpopular with labor unions, a traditional base of Democratic support.

Like the postwar generation of liberals, the neo-liberals were concerned with economic growth. Their approach stressed investment as the key to economic growth. They pursued this not through the supply-side strategy of cutting taxes to increase the money available for investment, but through industrial policy. Neo-liberals disagreed among themselves as to how tax cuts might be targeted. Some favored tax cuts for "sunrise industries" (industries that were growing and looked to be the future). Others did not trust government to pick the winners of the future and proposed tax cuts for job creation. Let the markets pick the winners, they argued, and government would simply reward a company for creating a new job.

Traditional liberals remained committed to centralization and to large institutions. Neo-liberals relied more on microeconomic than macroeconomic strategies and advocated decentralization. Small businesses (those with twenty or fewer employees) accounted for a significant majority of all new jobs created by the American economy. Moreover, young companies (under four years old) generated the bulk of new jobs. In response, neo-liberals advocated policies that encouraged entrepreneurship. An example of such policy would be a tax incentive for the creation of new jobs.

Many neo-liberals regarded information and services as the engine of the present and future economy. Their commitment to technology won them the (sometimes derisive) nickname of "Atari Democrats" (after a popular home computer game) in the 1970s. They claimed that they did not advocate abandoning the industrial base, but they pointed out that, while agriculture remained a significant part of the economy, it employed fewer people than it had a generation before. Neo-liberals expected manufacturing to follow a similar course.

Far more than traditional liberals, neo-liberals used the market for reference. They did not trust top-down economic controls to promote social goals. For example, their response to the problem of sodium in prepared foods would not be to regulate the amount of sodium in food but to require product labeling and to educate the public about the dangers of a high sodium diet.
The neo-liberals also emphasized risk. They argued that traditional liberalism, by attempting to eliminate risk, succeeded in eliminating many incentives to create wealth. Without the creation of new wealth, they argued, there would be no new jobs, and the battle for social justice would be set back.

The decline of American productivity was a central concern of neo-liberals. Influenced by Lester Thurow, an economist at MIT, they pointed out that liberal economists focused on stimulating demand while ignoring that greater demand might translate into the sales of Volkswagens and Toyotas rather than Chevrolets and Fords. Increasing productivity meant retooling America's basic industries to make them more efficient and shifting resources from low productivity ("sunset") industries to high productivity ("sunrise") industries. Neo-liberals relied on investment as the tool to accomplish this. Emphasis on investment focused on the supply side of economics, and in this sense their policies superficially resembled Reaganomics. However, the Republican policies of the 1980s were based on across-the-board tax cuts, predicated on the belief that a reduction in taxes would provide people with extra money, which they would use to save and invest. The neo-liberal approach focused on where and how investment should be directed and on specific encouragement to entrepreneurs through tax incentives. For example, tax incentives might be used to encourage investment in the infrastructure or investment in human capital (retraining older workers, providing skills and jobs for inner-city youths). As mentioned previously above, tax incentives might also be used to encourage the creation of new jobs.

Whether the neo-liberals produced workable answers for the economic problems of the 1990s and beyond remains to be seen. Their struggle for control of the Democratic party has been part of what may be a political realignment. The New Deal coalition ceased electing presidents in the late 1960s or early 1970s. Moreover, the policies of the New Deal became increasingly irrelevant to the economic and social problems of the end of the twentieth century.

Gary Hart's campaign for the Democratic nomination in 1984 marked the first neo-liberal challenge for the presidency. Four years later, Michael Dukakis came out of the neo-liberal camp, but had to tailor his politics to resemble those of a New Deal Democrat to win the nomination. That strategy served him poorly in the general election. Bill Clinton's claim to be a "new Democrat" and his victories in 1992 and 1996 are suggestive. He did not represent the neo-liberal agenda in the 1992 primaries; Paul Tsongas did. In the post-convention campaign, however, he attempted to reassert his neo-liberal credentials.

If nothing else, the last several presidential elections have demonstrated that profound political changes do not happen overnight. The direction of post-New Deal American politics remains unclear. Will the Republicans forge a new majority of urban professionals, the religious right, and the geographic West? Will social issues, in particular abortion, shatter the Republican coalition? Will the neo-liberals create a new Democratic coalition? Whatever the answers, one can be sure only that American political structures have repeatedly changed and evolved over more than two centuries. There is little reason to expect that the politics of the last two generations will be the politics of the next.
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James Earl Carter presided over one of the least successful presidencies of recent times. Under Carter, American foreign policy was in disarray; and the American economy, beset with inflation, high interest rates, and low growth, functioned poorly. By midpoint in his term, Carter's popularity was lower than any of the previous five presidents at a similar stage. The columnist Russell Baker observed that "if the Carter Administration were a television show, it would have been cancelled months ago." Part of the problem was the enormous disparity between what Carter had promised and his performance.

The first document is from Carter's inaugural address. The second document is from the speech he gave after canceling an address on energy policy and going into retreat at Camp David in 1979. There he met with a string of advisors. He emerged after ten days to deliver an address to the American people. Although he never used the term in his speech, the speech became known as his "malaise" speech because he complained of a malaise of the American spirit.


Questions for Discussion

1. What specific programs might one anticipate from Carter's inaugural address? Are any mentioned? What does he promise?

2. Although Carter admits to only "mixed success" in keeping the promises he made as a candidate, on what or whom does he blame the failures of his administration?

3. What was the public's reaction to the "malaise" speech? What would yours have been?
Jimmy Carter, Inaugural Address (1977)

This inauguration marks a new beginning, a new dedication within our government, and a new spirit among us all. A president may sense and proclaim that new spirit, but only a people can provide it.

Two centuries ago our nation's birth was a milestone in the long quest for freedom, but the bold and brilliant dream which excited the founders of our nation still awaits its consummation. I have no new dream to set forth today, but rather urge a fresh faith in the old dream....

You have given me a great responsibility—to stay close to you, to be worthy of you, and to exemplify what you are. Let us create together a new national spirit of unity and trust. Your strength can compensate for my weakness, and your wisdom can help to minimize my mistakes.

Let us learn together and laugh together and work together and pray together, confident that in the end we will triumph together in the right.

The American dream endures. We must once again have faith in our country—and in one another. I believe America can be better. We can be even stronger than before....

Within us, the people of the United States, there is evident a serious and purposeful rekindling of confidence, and I join in the hope that when my time as your President has ended, people might say this about our nation:

That we had remembered the words of Micah and renewed our search for humility, mercy, and justice.

That we had torn down the barriers that separated those of different race and region and religion, and where there had been mistrust, built unity, with a respect for diversity.

That we had found productive work for those able to perform it.

That we had strengthened the American family, which is the basis of our society.

That we had insured respect for the law, and equal treatment under the law, for the weak and the powerful, for the rich and the poor.

And that we had enabled our people to be proud of their own Government once again.

I would hope that the nations of the world might say that we had built a lasting peace, based not on weapons of war but on international policies which reflect our own most precious values.

These are not just my goals. And they will not be my accomplishments but the affirmation of our nation's continuing moral strength and our belief in an undiminished, ever-expanding American dream.
Good evening.

This is a special night for me. Exactly three years ago, on July 15, 1976, I accepted the nomination of my party to run for President of the United States. I promised you a President who is not isolated from the people, who feels your pain, and who shares your dreams and who draws his strength and his wisdom from you.

Ten days ago I had planned to speak to you again about a very important subject—energy. For the fifth time I would have described the urgency of the problem and laid out a series of legislative recommendations to the Congress. But as I was preparing to speak, I began to ask myself the same question that I now know has been troubling many of you. Why have we not been able to get together as a nation to resolve our serious energy problem?

It's clear that the true problems of our Nation are much deeper—deeper than gasoline lines or energy shortages, deeper even than inflation or recession. And I realize more than ever that as President I need your help. So, I decided to reach out and listen to the voices of America.

I invited to Camp David people from almost every segment of our society—business and labor, teachers and preachers, Governors, mayors, and private citizens. And then I left Camp David to listen to other Americans, men and women like you. It has been an extraordinary ten days, and I want to share with you what I've heard.

These ten days confirmed my belief in the decency and the strength and the wisdom of the American people, but it also bore out some of my long-standing concerns about our Nation's underlying problems.

I know, of course, being president, that government actions and legislation can be very important. That's why I've worked hard to put my campaign promises into law—and I have to admit, with just mixed success. But after listening to the American people I have been reminded again that all the legislation in the world can't fix what's wrong with America. So, I want to speak to you first tonight about a subject even more serious than energy or inflation. I want to talk to you right now about a fundamental threat to American democracy.

I do not mean our political and civil liberties. They will endure. And I do not refer to the outward strength of America, a nation that is at peace tonight everywhere in the world, with unmatched economic power and military might.

The threat is nearly invisible in ordinary ways. It is a crisis of confidence. It is a crisis that strikes at the very heart and soul and spirit of our national will. We can see this crisis in the growing doubt about the meaning of our own lives and in the loss of a unity of purpose for our Nation.

The erosion of our confidence in the future is threatening to destroy the social and the political fabric of America.

The symptoms of this crisis of the American spirit are all around us. For the first time in the history of our country a majority of our people believe that the next five years will be worse than the past five years. Two-thirds of our people do not even vote. The productivity of American workers is actually dropping, and the willingness of Americans to save for the future has fallen below that of all other people in the Western world.
Often you see paralysis and stagnation and drift. You don't like it, and neither do I. What can we do?

First of all, we must face the truth, and then we can change our course. We simply must have faith in each other, faith in our ability to govern ourselves, and faith in the future of this Nation. Restoring that faith and that confidence to America is now the most important task we face. It is a true challenge of this generation of Americans....

We are at a turning point in our history. There are two paths to choose. One is a path I've warned about tonight, the path that leads to fragmentation and self-interest. Down that road lies a mistaken idea of freedom, the right to grasp for ourselves some advantage over others. That path would be one of constant conflict between narrow interests ending in chaos and immobility. It is a certain route to failure.

All the traditions of our past, all the lessons of our heritage, all the promises of our future point to another path, the path of common purpose and the restoration of American values. That path leads to true freedom for our Nation and ourselves. We can take the first steps down that path as we begin to solve our energy problem....
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The text discusses the Reagan administration's decision to sell arms to Iran in an attempt to free American hostages held in Lebanon. Colonel Oliver North, an aide to National Security Advisor Robert McFarlane, arranged the transaction and used profits from the sale of arms to Iran to fund the Nicaraguan Contras. The Reagan administration had provided covert aid to the Contras until Congress banned such aid in October 1984. At that point, Reagan sought aid from other countries and private groups in the United States to help the Contras. North's plan to use profits (North liked the term "residuals") from the arms sales to Iran to fund the Contras came to light when Sandinista forces shot down a cargo plane bringing supplies to the Contras on October 5, 1986. The only survivor of the wreck was a former Marine who had worked for Air America (a CIA proprietary). Reporters quickly began to investigate ties between the downed plane and the United States government. On November 3, a Lebanese weekly published an account of the contacts between officials of the Reagan administration and the Iranian government. The story was inaccurate in some of the particulars, but it had a devastating impact in the United States. The American government had been caught selling weapons to a designated terrorist state in violation of its own policies. Reagan denied knowledge of the diversion of funds to aid the Contras, but polls showed that a majority of people did not believe him. Even if he did not know about the diversion, his critics pointed out, that indicated a lack of control of his own administration.

Two of Reagan's top advisors in foreign policy, Secretary of State George Schultz and Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, opposed the sale of arms to the Iranians. Each published memoirs not long after leaving office. The first document is Weinberger's account of a meeting of top officials of the Reagan administration held on December 7, 1985. It was the first high-level meeting at which the policy of selling arms to Iran was discussed. The second document is Schultz's version of events.

Questions for Discussion

1. The Iran-Contra affair damaged Reagan's credibility and his standing with the public. The text refers to the episode as a "self-inflicted wound." Do the accounts of Weinberger and Schultz support that analysis? If so, in what ways?

2. Schultz writes that Reagan was generally detached, but there were three or four issues about which he cared intensely and which he followed closely. One such issue was the plight of the American hostages in Lebanon. Do the two accounts support the image of Reagan as totally disengaged? Do they support Schultz's conclusion? If so, how? If not, why not?

3. Compare the two versions. What differences do you observe? What do these differences tell you about the events? What do they tell you about the two men who wrote the respective memoirs?
Caspar Weinberger, *Fighting for Peace* (1990)

I did not know of any of those proposals for Tows [missiles] to go from Israel to Iran, or of our furnishing replacements to Israel, but I do recall a meeting on August 6, 1985, with the President upstairs in the White House in which we all (George Schultz, [National Security Advisor] Robert McFarlane, Don Regan [White House Chief of Staff], and either Bill Casey [Director of the CIA] or John McMahon, his deputy) sat on the yellow upholstered couches at the end of the long main hall on the second floor of the White House residence quarters. The President was still in his hospital bathrobe....The issue came up again and again. Both George Schultz and I argued as forcefully as we possibly could against the whole idea, explaining how it would completely violate our agreed upon and accepted policy of not ransoming hostages, and that we should most certainly not give Iran arms directly or indirectly when we were pleading with our allies and friends all around the world not to allow any arms shipments of any kind to go to Iran....

The discredited Israeli and Iranian intermediaries with whom McFarlane continued to deal apparently intended that Israel's transfer of a hundred Tows was not conditioned upon a hostage release, but was only designed to show "good faith." For our hostages the Iranians demanded another 400 Tows from Israel, which McFarlane presumably felt we could thereafter also replenish for Israel.

On September 15, 1985, Reverend Benjamin Weir, one of our hostages, was released by his captors. Later I learned that on September 14, 1985, Israel had delivered 408 Tows to Iran. The release of all the remaining hostages, predicted by McFarlane, of course did not occur....

On November 30, 1985, McFarlane resigned....I later learned that on that same day Lieutenant Colonel North of the NSC staff proposed a new "arms-for-hostages" deal to McFarlane's successor, Admiral [John] Poindexter. That proposal...involved the transfer of 3,300 Israeli Tows and 50 Israeli Hawks in exchange for the release of all the hostages....

When that proposal was considered by the President on December 7, again Secretary Schultz and I opposed the plan in the strongest possible terms. I reiterated all my old arguments that we would be helping a country that seized Americans and held them hostage; that we had no assurances that they would let the hostages go; that we could not have any kind of relationship with a country like Iran and its viscerally anti-American leaders; that we would lose all credibility with our allies and Iraq if we sold arms to Iran; that such actions, last but not least, were probably illegal. George Schultz made the same points equally forcefully and probably more effectively.....

...Both George Schultz and I left that December 7 meeting feeling that the McFarlane trip had been blocked....

In any event, on January 7, 1986, at a meeting in which we all participated, and although Secretary Schultz and I again argued in the strongest possible terms against the very idea of letting Iran have any arms regardless of how convoluted the plan was, the President gave me the impression that he had approved the idea.
On December 5, 1985, Vice Admiral John Poindexter, who was appointed to succeed McFarlane as NSC adviser, told me that he had set up a meeting about Iran, arms sales, and hostages for Saturday, December 7....

On December 7, 1985, the president convened the meeting in the White House family quarters on this issue. I had prepared my views carefully and in detail. Also present were Cap Weinberger, John Poindexter, deputy CIA director John McMahon standing in for Bill Casey, Don Regan, and Bud McFarlane. Poindexter suggested that McFarlane, who was still active in this operation even after his resignation, contact the Iranians in London to ask them to release the hostages without receiving any military equipment. If they would do so, we would be prepared to reach a better understanding with Iran. I thought the prospects for success were minimal, but I did not object to that approach.

Poindexter then suggested that if the Iranians rejected this first proposal, McFarlane should be authorized to ask other countries to sell arms to Israel to replace those Israel would transfer to Iran: that idea I opposed vigorously. Such an effort was still trading U.S. arms for hostages, I said, and it would be a more complicated deal that would make us even more vulnerable: arms for hostages and arms to Iran were both terrible ideas! I argued that this was a betrayal of our policies and would only encourage more hostage taking. Cap Weinberger expressed the same point of view with genuine and unmistakable conviction. He got the president's attention by opening with a question. "Mr. President, do you really want to hear my opinion?" He stopped and looked at the president. He was very effective.

No decision was made at the meeting. But my sense was that the point of view that Cap and I argued had won the day. Later that day, Poindexter told me privately that when the project had fallen apart during Thanksgiving week, he had recommended to the president that we disengage. The president did not want to disengage, he said....

After the developments following the December 7, 1985, meeting, I heard nothing more about the issue of contacts with Iran for almost a month. Then, on January 7, 1986, I was suddenly called to a meeting with the president in the Oval Office on further developments regarding Iran. The new developments were much the same as they had been before....All the key players were present...I again argued fiercely and with passion against any arms sales to Iran, especially arms sales connected to the release of hostages. "Strangely enough, I agree with George," said Cap. No one else did....

I had an uneasy, uncanny feeling that the meeting was not a real meeting, that it had all been "precooked." I had the sense that a decision had already been made, though none was explicitly stated....

I learned a year later that the actual decision had been taken the day before, on January 6, when John Poindexter presented President Reagan with a draft "finding" authorizing arms sales to Iran. The president signed it....

At 11:30 on November 10 [1986], the president's national security group gathered in the Situation Room. The president opened. He had watched the Sunday talk shows, he said, and we were being taken apart without justification....

Poindexter then made a long presentation. There had been a "finding" on January 17, 1986....
"This is the first I ever heard of such a finding," I exploded. Cap was equally astounded....

I started asking tough questions about Poindexter's preposterous assertions. I could see immediately that Poindexter, and the president, regarded me as a problem. I asked about the 500 TOWs that Poindexter said had been shipped the previous week. He replied that the shipment had been arranged by Oliver North...North had reported to Poindexter that another two Americans would be released by the end of this week. "So if the 500 TOWs plus other items have been supplied to Iran in the context of hostage releases," I asked Poindexter, incredulously, "How can you say this is not an arms-for-hostages deal?"

The president jumped in, asserting, "It's not linked!"

Poindexter undercut him. "How else will we get the hostages out?" he asked me in an accusing tone. In that flash of candor, Poindexter had unwittingly ripped away whatever veil was left to the rational of a "changed Iran" as the reason for our arms sales.
CHAPTER 33

Misdemeanors and High Crimes

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The Election of 1988. Crime and scandal seemed to dominate the end of the twentieth century in America. Perhaps this was because problems that had dominated the nation's attention receded. The Soviet Union collapsed, and the American economy surged. However, the removal of Soviet domination permitted smoldering ethnic and religious tensions to flare up in former satellite states. Preoccupied with crimes and scandals, Americans failed to perceive an emerging new threat from abroad. George H. W. Bush, Reagan's vice-president, won his party's nomination. The Democratic field shrank from its original field of seven and became a contest between Michael S. Dukakis of Massachusetts and Jesse Jackson. Dukakis stressed his record as an efficient manager and defeated Jackson. Dukakis ran a lifeless campaign, and Bush damaged himself with the selection of Dan Quayle of Indiana as his running mate. Bush's campaign attacked Dukakis for being soft on crime. He carried the election with 54 percent of the popular vote and tallied 426 electoral votes to Dukakis's 112.

Crime and Punishment. During the 1980s, those demanding law and order realized many of their goals. Responding to widespread calls for a crackdown on crime, elected officials hired more police, passed mandatory sentencing laws, and built more prisons. After the Supreme Court ruled in 1972 that jury-imposed capital punishment was racially biased and therefore unconstitutional, states rewrote laws to eliminate the discretion of juries. The Supreme Court upheld these laws, and capital punishment resumed. State legislatures also made it more difficult for prisoners to obtain parole. As a result of lengthy mandatory sentences and restrictions on parole, the number of prisoners soared.

"Crack" and Urban Gangs. During the 1980s, several factors intensified the problem of violent crime, especially in the inner cities. The availability of crack cocaine, a relatively inexpensive and intensely powerful drug, contributed to crime. The lucrative crack trade led to turf wars and the spread of gangs. Violence and murder increased exponentially in black inner-city neighborhoods.

George H. W. Bush as President. Bush announced his intention to "make kinder the face of the nation and gentler the face of the world." He displayed a more traditional command of the workings of government than had his predecessor. He appeased conservatives by opposing abortion and gun control as well as his support for a constitutional amendment prohibiting the desecration of the flag. His standing in the polls soared.

The Collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe. Abroad, in an epic turn of events, Gorbachev's reforms in the Soviet Union led to demands for liberalization by the people of Eastern Europe. When Gorbachev announced that he would not use force to keep communist
governments in power in these nations, the people of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, and East Germany ousted their communist governments and moved toward more democratic forms of government. Soviet-style communism had been discredited, and the Warsaw Pact no longer posed a threat. The Berlin Wall crumbled, and Germany began the process of reunification. Bush supported these developments but refrained from embarrassing the Soviet Union. Bush and Gorbachev signed major arms control agreements.

In December 1989, the United States invaded Panama and forcibly brought its dictator, Manuel Noriega, to America to stand trial on drug conspiracy charges.

Economic conditions in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union continued to deteriorate. Civil war broke out in Yugoslavia, as Croatia and Slovenia sought independence from the Serbian-dominated central government. Throughout the Soviet Union, nationalist and anticommunist groups demanded greater control of their affairs. Various republics demanded independence. Gorbachev opposed the breakup of the Soviet Union and proposed a treaty of union that would have granted greater local autonomy. Before the treaty could be ratified, hard-line communists attempted a coup. Boris Yeltsin, the anticommunist president of the Russian Republic, defied the rebels and rallied opposition to the coup. The coup collapsed. In the aftermath of the coup, the Communist party was disbanded and the Soviet Union was replaced by a loose federation of independent states. Yeltsin led Russia, the most important of these republics.

The War in the Persian Gulf. President Saddam Hussein of Iraq invaded the oil-rich sheikdom of Kuwait in August 1990. Saddam hoped to gain control of Kuwait's oil and thereby increase his control to 25 percent of the world's total supply. He also massed his forces along the border of Saudi Arabia. The United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Egypt, and Syria moved troops to bases in Saudi Arabia. In November, the United Nations authorized the use of force to expel Iraq from Kuwait if it did not withdraw by January 15, 1991. Saddam refused to withdraw. On January 17, American forces unleashed an enormous air attack, which wreaked great devastation. On February 24, allied forces struck with overwhelming force and retook Kuwait. Bush recorded the highest approval ratings ever. In spite of expectations to the contrary and uprisings by the Kurds in northern Iraq and Shiite Moslems in the south, Saddam held on to power. Moreover, he refused to honor terms of the peace agreement. Critics argued that Bush should not have ended hostilities until Saddam's regime had been crushed.

The Deficit Worsens. Bush's campaign pledge of "no new taxes" and his proposals to cut capital gains taxes ran up against the mounting deficit. The end of the Cold War did not bring a peace dividend. The Persian Gulf War and the invasion of Panama cost a lot. In addition, Congress resisted cutting military bases or funding for defense contractors. Reducing popular but expensive entitlement programs such as Medicare and Social Security proved virtually impossible. Aid to the newly liberated countries of Eastern Europe also contributed to the burden on the federal treasury.

Looting the Savings and Loans. Another drag on the federal treasury was the collapse of hundreds of federally insured savings and loan institutions. These institutions provided home mortgages in communities all over the country. Congress allowed the S&Ls to enter the more
lucrative but riskier business of commercial loans and investments. Seeking to earn high yields, many S&LS invested in risky junk bonds or real estate. When the junk bond market collapsed and the real estate market stalled, hundreds of S&Ls went under. Because their deposits were insured by the federal government, the failures cost the taxpayers billions of dollars.

Whitewater and the Clintons. In 1977 the attorney general of Arkansas, Bill Clinton, and his wife, Hillary Rodham, joined with James and Susan McDougal to borrow money to develop vacation homes on land in the Ozarks. The proposed development, named Whitewater, failed. McDougal covered the losses with funds from a savings and loan company he owned. In 1989, McDougal's S&L collapsed and cost the federal government $60 million to reimburse depositors. In 1992, federal investigators claimed that the Clintons had been "potential beneficiaries" of illegal activities by McDougal and his S&L. By that time, Clinton was running for the Democratic nomination. However, the financial dealings were complicated, and voters seemed unable or unwilling to follow the story. Then, Whitewater was shoved into the background when a national tabloid reported that Clinton had for years engaged in an extramarital affair with Gennifer Flowers, who confirmed the story several days later. Clinton appeared on the CBS program, 60 Minutes, denied the story, and asked for forgiveness. The disingenuous appeal worked. Clinton won the nomination and improved his chances by picking Senator Albert Gore as a running mate.

The Election of 1992. Patrick Buchanan, an outspoken conservative, challenged Bush for the Republican nomination. Ross Perot, a billionaire from Texas, charged that both parties had lost touch with the people and announced his independent candidacy. Bush easily won the Republican nomination, but Buchanan and Perot had inflicted serious damage on Bush and the Republican party. Clinton's campaign attacked Bush's handling of the economy. Clinton won a plurality of popular votes cast and a commanding victory in the electoral college.

A New Start: Clinton. Clinton set out to reverse many of the policies of the Reagan-Bush era, but when opposition developed, he tended to back down. This led some critics to conclude that Clinton was a poor leader. During the campaign, Clinton had promised to end the ban on gays and lesbians in the armed services, but when the Joint Chiefs and many in Congress objected, he settled for a pallid compromise. Clinton did reverse policies of the Bush administration when he signed a revived family leave bill into law and authorized the use of fetal tissue for research. Although the Supreme Court showed no inclination to overturn Roe v. Wade, Clinton solidified the pro-choice majority when he appointed Ruth Bader Ginsburg to replace Byron White.

During the campaign, Clinton had promised to deal with health care and the budget deficit. Clinton proposed cutting the deficit by $500 billion in five years, half by spending cuts and half by new taxes. Even some Democrats balked at Clinton's budget, and the president had to accept major changes. Clinton appointed a committee, headed by his wife, to reform the health care system. The committee's proposals seemed even more complicated and more costly than the existing system, and the plan failed to generate support from the medical profession, the insurance industry, and many ordinary people. The plan never came to a vote in Congress.
Emergence of the Republican Majority. In spite of Clinton's ability to brush it aside during the campaign, the Whitewater scandal began to gnaw at his presidency. Public pressure eventually forced the attorney General, Janet Reno, to appoint a special prosecutor, Kenneth W. Starr. More troubles followed when an employee of the state of Arkansas, Paula Corbin Jones, accused Clinton of sexually harassing her when he was governor of Arkansas.

Clinton's troubles gave the Republicans hope for the congressional elections of 1994. Led by Newt Gingrich of Georgia, Republicans offered an ambitious program that promised to cut the federal debt, reduce income taxes, turn many functions of the federal government over to the states, and eliminate environmental regulations.

Republicans won control of both houses of Congress. Led by Speaker Newt Gingrich, the new Republican majority in Congress passed nearly all of the provisions of their "contract with America." Clinton vetoed the budget passed by Congress. When both sides refused to compromise, the government ran out of money and shut down all but essential services.

The Election of 1996. The public blamed Congress for the shutdowns, and the President's standing in the polls rose. Clinton also benefited from the economic upturn that began in 1992. Clinton faced no opposition for renomination in 1996. The Republicans nominated Robert Dole of Kansas, the majority leader in the Senate. Dole failed to capture the imagination of voters, either with a proposal to cut taxes by 15 percent or by raising the issue of Clinton's character. Clinton won a decisive victory, but the Republicans retained control of both houses of Congress.

A Racial Divide. Racial divisions came into sharp relief with the arrest and trial of O. J. Simpson, a former star running back for the University of Southern California and the Buffalo Bills, for the murder of his estranged wife and another man (who were both white). Simpson was acquitted after a long and tempestuous trial. Reaction to the trial highlighted the cultural divide between whites and blacks. While 85% of blacks agreed with the not guilty verdict in the criminal case, only 34% of whites did. Indeed, many believed that the cultural chasm between whites and blacks was widening. Some worried that educated Americans of both races had given up on integration. Louis Farrakhan's "Million Man March" excluded whites. Inequality of income persisted, and the gap between blacks and whites in educational performance widened. Affirmative action programs fell out of favor. Although older forms of racism, enforced by law and custom, had become illegal or socially unacceptable, Americans appeared to be moving toward "a kind of voluntary apartheid." At the same time, whites were three times more likely to live near a black neighbor in 1994 than in 1964, and a greater percentage of both races approved of marriages between blacks and whites.

Violence and Popular Culture. Depictions of violence in popular culture became bloodier and more intense. Violence in movies and television was more common and more graphic. Rock videos on MTV featured violence and sexually suggestive material. A new musical expression called rap emerged from the ghetto. Rap lyrics expressed rage, defiance, and misogyny. Rap quickly found an audience among young whites. The violation of social norms has long been part of adolescence, and most consumers of popular culture had little
difficulty distinguishing between fantasy and real life. A few, however, acted out destructive fantasies. A series of shootings in schools led some to wonder about the relationship of depictions of violence to violence in real life.

**Clinton Impeached.** Clinton denied allegations of womanizing. A judge required him to testify in a lawsuit brought by Paula Corbin Jones alleging that Clinton made improper sexual advances to her. In an effort to support their case, Jones's lawyers sought to show that Clinton had a history of making sexual advances to women. In the process, they subpoenaed a former White House intern named Monica Lewinsky. Both Clinton and Lewinsky denied that they had had an affair. Clinton told a news conference: "I did not have sexual relations with that woman, Miss Lewinsky." Hillary Clinton denounced the allegations as part of a "vast right-wing conspiracy." However, Lewinsky had confided in Linda Tripp, who had recorded their conversations. Tripp turned the tapes over to the special prosecutor, Kenneth Starr. Clinton and Lewinsky appeared to have lied under oath. Under the threat of an indictment for perjury, Lewinsky repudiated her earlier testimony. When Starr called him to testify before a grand jury, Clinton admitted to "inappropriate intimate contact" but responded with legalistic obfuscation.

Newt Gingrich decided to make Clinton's behavior the focus of the fall elections of 1998. Republicans lost seats, however, and Gingrich resigned as Speaker.

Starr submitted a report that concluded that Clinton's behavior warranted that the House of Representatives consider impeachment. The House voted to impeach Clinton, but the Senate failed to muster the necessary two-thirds vote necessary to convict and remove the president. Clinton remained in office.

**Clinton's Legacy.** Clinton's presidency coincided with the longest economic boom in American history. He deserves some credit for the prosperity of the 1990s. Reducing the deficit kept interest rates down and spurred investment. The surging economy resulted in the lowest unemployment since the 1960s, and inflation fell to levels unseen since the 1950s. The economic expansion generated greater income for the government. By the 2000 fiscal year, the surplus hit $237 billion.

Clinton also promoted globalization of the economy. His belief that American corporations could prevail in global markets proved essentially correct. However, not all prospered in the new global economy. Union leaders bitterly asked how their members could compete against convict labor in China or sweatshop workers in Indonesia and Malaysia. Others complained that worldwide economic growth threatened the environment.

In foreign affairs, Clinton left a mixed record. He failed to assemble an international force to prevent "ethnic cleansing" (the removal of Bosnian Muslims) by Serbian troops in Bosnia. An American intervention in Somalia resulted in the death of fifteen American commandos and ended in failure. On the other hand, a bombing campaign by NATO prevented Yugoslavia from crushing the predominantly Muslim province of Kosovo. Clinton also failed to achieve a resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Whatever the successes and failures of his administration, Clinton will be best remembered for his relationship with a White House intern.
The Economic Boom and the Internet. Clinton survived the scandals and impeachment thanks in part to a robust economy. New technologies, such as cellular phones and genetic engineering, contributed significantly to booming prosperity. But the most important development was a revolutionary means of communication: the Internet. In 1995, software giant Microsoft introduced a "point and click" Windows operating system that made it easy for users of IBM and IBM-compatible computers to issue complex commands. Some visionaries recognized ways to make money through the Internet. Jeff Bezos founded Amazon.com to sell books over the Internet. Venture capitalists poured money into new Internet ventures. Dot-com stocks rose rapidly, even though very few of the companies made any profits and some generated no revenue whatsoever. In the spring of 2000, a wave of selling hit the technology stocks; dot-com stocks were particularly hard hit. Soon the selling spilled over to other companies.

The 2000 Election: George W. Bush Wins by One Vote. In seeking the presidency, Clinton's vice president, Al Gore, attempted to link himself to the prosperity of the Clinton years and to distance himself from the Clinton scandals. Gore ran afoul of election laws when he solicited contributions too energetically and in inappropriate places (ranging from a Buddhist temple to the White House itself). Nevertheless, Gore won the Democratic nomination and chose as his running mate Senator Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut, an orthodox Jew.

The leading Republican contender was George W. Bush, the governor of Texas and son of former President Bush. Bush faced a tough challenge from Senator John McCain of Arizona, a former Navy pilot who had spent five years as a prisoner of war in North Vietnam. Ultimately, Bush prevailed and selected as his running mate Richard Cheney, who had served as secretary of defense in President Bush's administration.

Ralph Nader, a consumer activist, ran on the Green Party ticket.


The election resulted in a virtual tie, and Bush's apparent narrow victory in Florida gave him the electoral votes to claim the White House. Gore challenged the Florida result, however, and the matter ended up in the courts. Finally, on December 12, the Supreme Court ruled that the selective hand recounts demanded by Gore violated the Constitution's guarantee of equal protection. Bush's narrow victory would stand.

Terrorism Intensifies. With the fall of the Soviet Union, American military might seemed unassailable. The end of the Cold War, however, brought new and destabilizing forces to the fore. In Arab nations, rulers cultivated popular support by denouncing Israel. The United States urged Israel to return land seized during the 1967 war in exchange for peace. Israelis, however, did not believe that Arab leaders who had called for the destruction of Israel, funded terrorism, and trained terrorists would ever recognize Israel’s right to exist. American diplomats also called on Arab leaders to demonstrate good faith by ending terrorism as a means of gaining territorial concessions from Israel. Arab leaders, who ruled countries plagued by poverty, knew that they could always deflect attention from domestic failures with issuing rousing attacks on Israel. American support for Israel made the United States a focal point for Arab rage. Terrorist organizations launched a number of attacks on American
targets. In 1998, Osama bin Laden, the son of a Saudi oil billionaire emerged as a leading figure among the terrorists. Protected by the Taliban, an extremist Islamic group that controlled Afghanistan, bin Laden pledged to attack American civilian and military targets as well as those of America’s allies. Following this threat, bin Laden’s organization, al Qaeda, carried out bombing of U.S. embassies in Nairobi and Dar es-Salaam in southern Africa.

**September 11, 2001.** On September 11, 2001, terrorists hijacked four passenger airplanes. They flew two of the planes into the World Trade Center buildings in New York and a third into the Pentagon in Washington. The fourth plane crashed into the Pennsylvania countryside after passengers attempted to retake the plane. Investigations quickly linked the hijackers to al-Qaeda. Bin Laden, who had been indicted for the 1998 bombing of U.S. embassies in Africa and for the attack on the USS Cole, had been operating out of Afghanistan, a country ruled by the Taliban, an extremist Islamic group.

That evening, President Bush spoke powerfully. He pledged to find the parties responsible and make them pay. He also promised to hold nations harboring terrorists equally responsible.

Adding to Americans’ sense of unease, several letters addressed to government officials included threatening messages and anthrax spores. Six postal workers and mail recipients died.

**America Fights Back: War in Afghanistan.** Bush declared a war on terror. In spite of Bush’s earlier opposition to ill-defined military operations, he undertook a war against terrorist cells that operated in many countries. On September 20, Bush demanded that the Taliban surrender bin Laden and top al-Qaeda leaders. In response, Bush unleashed a devastatingly effective attack with high technology weapons. The Taliban were driven from power.

**The Second Iraq War.** After the defeat of the Taliban, Bush declared that he would not “wait on events while dangers gather” and warned that the United States would take “preemptive actions” against regimes that threatened the United States. Bush identified Iran, North Korea, and Iraq as three such nations. Bush focused on Iraq. Vice President Dick Cheney, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, and others in the administration believed that Iraqis would welcome liberation and that a free Iraq would stimulate reforms throughout the Middle East. Bush obtained congressional approval to take action against Iraq, which was believed to have chemical and biological weapons and to have been developing nuclear weapons. Moreover, Iraq had not cooperated with UN inspectors. The Security Council ordered Sadddam to cooperate or face “serious consequences. By March 2003, Bush became impatient with the Security Council, which refused to take action against Saddam. Joined by Great Britain, Italy, Spain, and some other countries, he launched an attack to remove Saddam from power. Rather than the army of half a million troops recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Rumsfled insisted on a smaller, faster, and cheaper force of 125,000. The coalition easily toppled Saddam’s regime, but Iraq was in a state of chaos. There were not enough American and coalition forces to preserve order or install a new government. Islamic radicals, increasingly joined by supporters of Saddam launched an insurgency against American and coalition forces as well as Iraqi civilians.
The Election of 2004. By fall 2003, the war in Iraq had become an issue in the presidential campaign. Howard Dean, the former governor of Vermont, established a substantial lead among Democratic candidates for the nomination by cleverly using the internet to recruit supporters and to raise money. He also vehemently denounced the war in Iraq. Worried that the widespread perception of Dean as an ultra-liberal might lead to a landslide victory for Bush, many Democrats looked for a candidate with appeal beyond the party. Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts positioned himself as the alternative to Dean. With victories in the Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary, Kerry dealt Dean’s candidacy a devastating blow. Dean finished the job with a concession speech that many regarded as nearly hysterical. Kerry made his record as a decorated Vietnam veteran a focal point of his campaign. This backfired when some fellow veterans questioned his record. Others attacked Kerry for testimony he gave before a congressional committee in 1971 in which he had charged American servicemen with atrocities. Kerry also faced difficulties because he voted for the authorization to use force and against a supplemental appropriation for the war. Kerry’s explanation, that “I actually voted for the $87 billion before I voted against it,” did not help his cause. Bush attacked Kerry as a liberal and mobilized conservatives and religious fundamentalists. Bush won by about three and a half million votes and carried the electoral college by 286 to 252.

The Imponderable Future. The conventional wisdom maintained that "everything changed" after the attack on the World Trade Center. The economic repercussions of the attack were staggering; the travel industry was crippled, and the federal surplus vanished. At the same time, Americans united in a way they had not for over a generation. What will come of these events is impossible to tell. Historians can explain how and why things happened. However, they have no ability to predict the future.

POINTS FOR MASTERY

Students should be able to explain:

1. The issue of violent crime in America and the use politicians have made of it.

2. Events leading to the end of the Cold War.

3. The problems confronting the first President Bush.

4. The causes and consequences of the war in the Persian Gulf.

5. The factors leading the decline in Bush's popularity.

6. How some of the traits that helped Clinton win the election hindered his ability to govern effectively.
7. The issues that led to the Republican victory in the congressional elections of 1994.
8. The reasons for the unpopularity of the Republican Congress.
9. The factors leading to Clinton's reelection in 1996.
10. Factors that led some to conclude that the racial divide in America was growing.
11. Events leading to the impeachment of Bill Clinton.
12. Clinton's mixed legacy.
13. The reasons for the economic boom of the 1990s and for its collapse.
15. The growing role of terrorism in the 1980s and 1990s.
16. Events surrounding the attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and their aftermath.
17. America's war on terror.

POINTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

1. How does one account for the enormous swings in George H. W. Bush's popularity? Was he a better president in 1991 than in 1992? Does the president get too much credit when things seem to be going well? Does the president take too much blame when things go wrong?

2. In discussing the crisis involving savings and loan institutions, the text fails to mention the origins of the crisis in the 1970s. Record high interest rates meant that the S&Ls had to pay far higher rates to obtain money than they earned from the long-term mortgages that were their primary business. As a result, they began to lose money at alarming rates. Efforts to recoup these losses accounted for the more aggressive (and riskier) practices they undertook when Congress deregulated the S&L industry in the 1980s. What role did Carter's economic policies play in the S&L crisis?

3. Especially in the area of foreign policy, Clinton criticized many of Bush's policies (Haiti, Bosnia, China) and then adopted policies virtually identical to those Bush had followed. What might account for this?
4. During the campaign, Clinton claimed to be a "new Democrat." What in his presidency supported that claim? What resembled traditional Democratic policies? Why did one see evidence of both?

5. Republicans captured Congress in 1994 on the basis of their Contract with America. The attempt to implement that contract, however, led to the revival of Clinton's political fortunes. How do you explain this?

6. In what respects have race relations improved in the United States since the 1960s? In what respects have they worsened? How would one make a balanced assessment of the changes in race relations over the last several decades?

7. The text discusses the election of 2000 but fails to offer any explanation of why the two-term vice president of an administration that presided over a time of great prosperity failed to win the election easily. What factors accounted for Gore's showing?

8. In the last twenty years, terrorism has forced itself onto center stage of world events (see the “Mapping the Past” section). Terrorism however, remains a slippery concept. A frequently used aphorism claims that “one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.” That simple-minded formulation fails adequately to deal with the problem. One can be a freedom fighter without being a terrorist; one can also be a freedom fighter and a terrorist. What conclusions can one draw from the account of “twenty years of terrorism”?

LECTURE SUPPLEMENT

The textbook discusses several social issues that have commanded the attention of the American people in the 1990s, such as racial divisions, fear of terrorism, and the social consequences of profound economic transformations. Americans have also been acutely concerned with the state of their culture. The late 1980s and early 1990s saw the culture wars erupt on college campuses. Americans have debated the impact of depictions of violence in films, books, video games, and television. Sexuality has permeated American culture, to the delight of some and the dismay of others. The role of religion in public life has been the subject of heated debate. As a consequence, the decade of the 1990s produced some interesting examples of social criticism. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., bemoaned what he called The Disuniting of America (1991) in his response to the academic culture wars. Christopher Lasch produced a searing critique of managerial elites in his posthumously published book, The Revolt of the Elites (1995). Robert Hughes, an Australian who has lived in the United States since 1970, produced one of the decade's most colorful examples of cultural criticism. The son of a prominent Australian family, Hughes migrated to the United States and became the art critic for Time magazine. His television series on modern art and on the history of American art (and the books he wrote to accompany them) garnered a wide audience for Hughes' straightforward, unpretentious, and often witty style. In Culture of Complaint, he applied his critical eye to the state of American culture.
Hughes draws compelling connections between culture and what he describes as "the broken polity." He argues that the American political community is threatened by cultural separatism, the debasement of language, the debasement of education, the debasement (through the politicization) of art, and the pervasiveness of a therapeutic culture that denies responsibility and fosters a cult of victimization.

Hughes bemoans the development of separatism in American society under the guise of multiculturalism. Much of what is done in the name of multiculturalism perverts the concept. True multiculturalism, according to Hughes, is part of the best tradition of America. "There never was" writes Hughes, "a core America in which everyone looked the same, spoke the same language, worshipped the same gods and believed the same things. Even before the Europeans arrived, American Indians were constantly at one another's throats." Since it is not defined by race, inherited class, or ancestral territory, "America is a construction of mind." Coming from diverse backgrounds, Americans have had "no choice but to live in recognition of difference." Indeed, "the social richness of America...comes from the diversity of its tribes."

Contemporary advocates of multiculturalism, however, mean something else. They certainly display less than a "genuine curiosity about other cultural forms." The multiculturalist attack on "Eurocentrism" betrays a profound ignorance; it conflates the enormous variety of often contradictory cultural traditions that make up Europe. As practiced by its proponents, multiculturalism means separatism. While true multiculturalism "asserts that people with different roots can co-exist" and that they can learn to understand each other, separatism "denies the value, even the possibility, of such a dialogue." Thus, separatism threatens the American polity.

Another threat to the political community Hughes identifies comes from the therapeutic culture, with its emphasis on self-improvement, "self-esteem," and victimization. The claim of victimization trumps all other claims. It absolves individuals and groups of responsibility for their actions. It contributes to a decline in educational standards and a perversion of art.

Hughes further contends that the debasement of language, often associated with the culture of therapy and with sensitivities linked to cultural separatism, threatens the American polity. With respect to the "affected contortions" of politically correct language, Hughes argues that if they "made people treat one another with more civility and understanding, there might be an argument for them." "But," Hughes maintains, "they do no such thing." Hughes mocks "the notion that you change a situation by finding a newer and nicer word for it." However, such a shifting of words does damage the language. The possibility of real communication gets lost in a storm of euphemism. One cannot sustain a political dialogue, much less a political community, in such an environment.

Political correctness and the therapeutic culture have combined to devastate education. Students arrive at college with inadequate skills and little knowledge. Indeed, they sometimes arrive equipped with misinformation or fantasy of the sort included in the Portland African-American Baseline Essays. Much of this is done in the name of "self-esteem." As Hughes points out, however, meaningful self-esteem "comes from doing things well, from discovering how to tell a truth from a lie," not from being told one is doing well irrespective of performance. Once students arrive in college,
the education they receive...is downscaled to their reduced ability to read texts, sift information and analyze ideas....[It is] geared to the students' limited experience of life and ideas as though this were some kind of educational absolute (whereas, of course, it is the thing that real education seeks to challenge and expand), mushy with superficial social-studies courses that inculcate only buzzwords and are designed, as far as possible, to avoid hard questions of historical context, it is short on analysis and critical scrutiny but long on attitude and feeling.

This has created an environment in which true education is virtually impossible.

Untrained in logical analysis, ill-equipped to develop and construct formal arguments about issues, unused to mining texts for deposits of factual material, the students fell back on the only position they could truly call their own: what they felt about things. When feelings and attitudes are the main referents of argument, to attack any position is automatically to insult its holder, or even to assail his or her perceived "rights"...

Finally, Hughes turns his attack on what such concepts have done to art. Attempts to deny funding from the National Endowment for the Arts on the basis of political or other content derives from the principle that "art ought to be morally and spiritually uplifting." Hughes maintains that "Americans do seem to feel...that the main justification for art is its therapeutic power." This is true not only of the would-be censors on the right but the politically motivated artists on the left. The notion that art "can provoke social change" has, according to Hughes, "been refuted by experience." Most troubling to Hughes is that so much of this art is "badly made." Art as politics degenerates into the belief that "mere expressiveness is enough; that I become an artist by showing you my warm guts and defying you to reject them." The emphasis becomes the personal, the expressive.

Satire is distrusted as elitist. Hence the discipline of art, indicated by a love of structure, clarity, complexity, nuance and imaginative ambition, recedes; and claims to exemption come forward. I am a victim: how dare you impose your aesthetic standards on me? Don't you see that you have damaged me so badly that I need only display my wounds and call it art?

Indeed, some have argued essentially that the very idea of quality "is a plot. It is the result of a conspiracy of white males to marginalize the work of other races and cultures." This gives rise to the assumption that one's cultural reach is determined and limited by one's race, gender, ethnicity, religion, or sexual preference.

In this Hughes sees the link between culture and politics. If expression, whether artistic or political, becomes debased to the point of meaninglessness, if the polity is not educated enough to distinguish truth from falsehood or fantasy, if therapeutic catch phrases deny individual responsibility, then there is no basis on which to maintain a republican polity.
Pornography presents a difficult issue for American society and American law. The United States has a commitment, at least in theory, to unregulated speech and press. The command of the First Amendment is clear: "Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech." Yet the freedom to speak is not absolute. Slander, libel, and incitement to riot are prohibited on the theory that these forms of speech constitute acts that create an injury. Less clear is the area of obscenity, which the courts have nonetheless long considered outside the protection of the First Amendment.

Modern obscenity law dates from the Supreme Court's decision in Roth v. U.S. (1957). Justice William Brennan, writing for the majority, held that "all ideas having even the slightest redeeming social importance unorthodox ideas, controversial ideas, even ideas hateful to the prevailing climate of opinion have the full protections" of the Constitution. Obscenity, however, fell outside of those protections. Brennan then turned to the question of what constituted obscenity. "Sex and obscenity," the justice ruled, were "not synonymous." Obscenity, he continued, was material "which deals with sex in a manner appealing to prurient interests" and "utterly without redeeming social importance."

Justices William O. Douglas and Hugo Black dissented. They argued that the majority's standard of "community conscience" inflicted punishment "for thoughts provoked, not for overt acts or anti-social conduct" and therefore fell afoul of the First Amendment. Speech or writing, they maintained, could be suppressed only when they amounted to conduct or were "so closely brigaded with illegal action as to be an inescapable part of it." They warned that "the test that suppresses a cheap tract today can suppress a literary gem tomorrow."

For years after Roth, the Supreme Court struggled to construct a satisfactory definition of obscenity. After a number of decisions failed to establish a clear definition, the Court, in Redrup v. New York (1967), essentially decided that any material a majority of the justices held not obscene came under the protection of the First Amendment.

The Supreme Court changed composition in the late 1960s and early 1970s with the retirement of Chief Justice Earl Warren, his replacement by Warren Burger, and the addition of three other justices appointed by Richard Nixon. The new Court tried once again to define obscenity in Miller v. California (1973). Miller affirmed two elements of the Roth test, as refined by the Court in Memoirs of a Lady of Pleasure v. Massachusetts (1966). The Court held that material was obscenity if an "'average person, applying contemporary standards' would find that the work, taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest." In determining whether the material qualified as obscene, the trier of fact would apply state law and "contemporary community standards." However, in a departure from earlier decisions, Miller held that the standards applied would be those of the local, rather than the national, community. Moreover, Miller rejected the earlier standard of "utterly without redeeming social importance" and substituted a new test. It held that material needed to be only "lacking serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value" to be obscene. In its effort to clarify a standard of obscenity, the Court succeeded only in further clouding the waters.
In the 1980s, feminist activists, including Andrea Dworkin and Catherine MacKinnon argued that pornography promoted discrimination against women and therefore violated the civil rights of women. In 1984, the courts struck down a law passed by the city of Indianapolis based on that theory (American Booksellers Association v. Hudnut).

The first essay is by Dworkin and comes from her testimony before the Attorney General's Commission on Pornography in 1986. On the issue of censoring pornography, Ronald Reagan's attorney general, Edwin Meese, and Dworkin, whose views are generally leftist, found common ground. Both favored suppression of pornography.

Not all women, and not all feminists, agree with Dworkin's position in favor of censorship. Nadine Strossen, president of the American Civil Liberties Union, argues that "the feminist procensorship movement is a far greater threat to women's rights than is the sexual expression it condemns with the epithet 'pornography.' For women who cherish liberty and equality, Big Sister is as unwelcome in our lives as Big Brother." The second document, written by Barbara Dority, executive director of the Washington Coalition Against Censorship and co-chairperson of the Northwest Feminist Anti-Censorship Taskforce, argues the feminist case against censorship.

Questions for Discussion

1. Dworkin asserts that pornography causes rape. Does she establish her case? What evidence would support her assertion?

2. Dworkin makes no distinction between publications such as Playboy and hard core pornography. She maintains that they have the same basic effect. Does this strengthen or weaken her argument?

3. Justice Brennan wrote that depictions of "sex and obscenity are not synonymous." Does Dworkin agree?

4. Dority draws a distinction between discrimination and prejudice. Discrimination is illegal; the right to hold prejudiced views is protected by the Constitution. What is the difference between prejudice and discrimination?

5. Dority asserts that censorship is "always used against feminist goals" and "to limit women's rights in the name of protection." Is she correct?

6. Dority challenges the connection between pornography and rape. What is the difference between correlation, on the one hand, and cause and effect, on the other? If a rapist is found to have pornographic material in his home, what conclusions can be drawn? Does it mean pornography causes rape? Does it mean that rapists enjoy pornography? Does it mean that this single rapist enjoys pornography? Does it establish any causal link at all?

My name is Andrea Dworkin. I am a citizen of the United States, and in this country where I live, every year millions and millions of pictures are being made of women with our legs spread....Millions and millions of pictures are made of us in postures of submission and sexual access...And the major motif of pornography as a form of entertainment is that women are raped and violated and humiliated until we discover that we like it and at that point we ask for more.

...there is a pornography of the humiliation of women where every single way of humiliating a human being is taken to be a form of sexual pleasure for the viewer and for the victim; where women are covered in filth, including feces, including mud, including paint, including blood, including semen, where women are tortured for the sexual pleasure of those who watch and those who do the torture, where women are murdered for the sexual pleasure of murdering women, and this material exists because it is fun, because it is entertainment, because it is a form of pleasure, and there are those who say it is a form of freedom.

Certainly it is freedom for those who do it. Certainly it is freedom for those who use it as entertainment, but we are also asked to believe that it is freedom for those to whom it is done.

Then this entertainment is taken, and it is used on other women, women who aren't in the pornography, to force those women into prostitution, to make them imitate the acts in the pornography. The women in the pornography, sixty-five to seventy percent of them we believe are victims of incest or child sexual abuse. They are poor women; they are not women who have opportunities in this society. They are frequently runaways who are picked up by pimps and exploited. They are frequently raped, the rapes are filmed, they are kept in prostitution by blackmail. The pornography is used on prostitutes by johns who expect them to replicate the sexual acts in the pornography, no matter how damaging it is.

Pornography is used in rape—to plan it to execute it to choreograph it, to engender the excitement to commit the act....

In 1979 we had a $4-billion-a-year industry [in pornography] in this country. By 1985 it was an $8-billion-a-year industry. Those consumers include men in all walks of life: Lawyers, politicians, writers, professors, owners of media, police, doctors, maybe even presidential commissions....

And no matter where we look we can't find the consumers. But what we learn is the meaning of first class citizenship, and the meaning of first-class citizenship is that you can use your authority as men and as professionals to protect pornography both by developing arguments to protect it and by using real social and economic power to protect it.

And as a result of all of this, the harm to women remains invisible; even though we have the bodies, the harm to women remains invisible. Underlying the invisibility of this harm is an assumption that what is done to women is natural, that even if a woman is forced to do something, somehow it falls within the sphere of her natural responsibilities as a woman. When the same things are done to boys, those things are perceived as an outrage. They are called unnatural....

In addition, the harm to women of pornography is invisible because most sexual abuse still occurs in private....
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Now, we have been told that we have an argument here about speech, not about women being hurt. And yet the emblem of that argument is a woman bound and gagged and we are supposed to believe that is speech. Who is that speech for? We have women being tortured and we are told that that is somebody's speech? Whose speech is it? It's the speech of a pimp, it is not the speech of a woman....

The reality for women in this society is that pornography creates silence for women. The pornographers silence women. Our bodies are their language. Their speech is made out of our exploitation, our subservience, our injury and our pain, and they can't say anything without hurting us, and when you protect them, you protect only their right to exploit and hurt us.

Pornography is a civil rights issue for women because pornography sexualizes inequality, because it turns women into subhuman creatures.

Pornography is a civil rights issue for women because it is the systematic exploitation of a group of people because of a condition of birth. Pornography creates bigotry and hostility and aggression towards all women, targets of all women, without exception.

The issue of "pornography" had engendered an intense debate within the feminist movement. Will feminism, having achieved some significant gains, continue to capitulate to moralistic forces, or will it wake up and take a stand for the liberation of women in all domains, including the difficult and often contradictory domain of sexual expression?...

As a feminist secular humanist and a card-carrying member of the American Civil Liberties Union, I believe the writers of the First Amendment meant every word exactly and literally: "Congress shall make no law...abridging the freedom of speech or of the press...." No law means no law....

The moralistic pro-censorship mind set has remained the same throughout the history of civilization. The censors aim at protecting us from the perceived harmful effects of what we read, see and hear. Historically, they did this to protect our souls from blasphemy or society from alien political, social, or economic ideas. Today, it is being done to protect us from explicit sexual imagery and words. The justification, however, remains the same: it is best for us and best for society.

The Highly subjective term pornography is grossly overused and abused. A wide range of materials has been so classified by feminists and summarily condemned, boycotted, picketed, and even banned.

The definition of pornography from Webster is: "The depiction of erotic behavior (as in pictures or writing) intended to cause sexual excitement." The blanket condemnation of all such materials is cause for grave concern....Most members of the feminist movement endorse and promote..."antipornography" ordinances.

Despite their claims to a mandate, these women do not speak for all feminists....

Many of us believe that feminism and civil liberties are inextricable. We remind our sisters that history has repeatedly shown that censorship and suppression work directly against feminist goals and are always used to limit women's rights in the name of protection....

We ask: whose definitions shall we use? Who will decide? Who will make all the necessary individual judgments? Who will distinguish "dehumanizing, objectifying, degrading" materials from "erotica"?

Many leaders in the feminist movement assert that the message of all "pornography" even "soft-core," is that all women are slaves whose bodies are for sale and available to be used and degraded. Again, this is not the only feminist view. For example, many feminists do not believe that Playboy and Penthouse are sexist, or that the presentation of the naked female body, whether or not in "inviting positions," is intrinsically sexist....

Many feminist leaders tell us that "pornography" is sex discrimination and hate literature against women—a violation of women's civil rights. But the history and intent of civil rights law and case law are clear: discrimination is not what people say or write about other people; it is what people do to other people. Individuals cannot be persecuted, censored, or condemned for their ideas. In a free society, there are not crimes of thought—only crimes of action.

...Many feminists tell us that "pornography" causes sexism and violence against women. But this claim draws on simplistic behaviorist psychology and has been repeatedly discredited by reputable specialists in sexual behavior. Even the notorious Meese commission reported that no such causal link can be substantiated....
The claim that certain forms of expression are dangerous and an incitement to violence has been used time after time to try to prohibit speech that some people don't like. Although some of us do not support this exception to the First Amendment, the notion of a "clear and present danger" was evolved to address this threat. For "pornography" to be suppressed under this test, we would have to demonstrate that any viewer is likely to be provoked to sexual violence immediately upon seeing it.

Anecdotal stories of sex offenders who are found to possess "pornography" are often cited. Sporadic incidents do not prove a correlation, nor does a correlation prove causation. Even if it is assumed that a small percentage of people are "encouraged" to engage in sexist behavior or commit violent acts after exposure to certain books for films, this still would not justify suppression. Such a "pervert's veto" would threaten a broad range of literature and film. A free society must accept the risks that come with liberty....

Charles Manson testified that he was inspired by the biblical Book of Revelation to commit multiple murders....

If viewing and reading sexually explicit and violent materials caused people to become sex criminals, all the members of the Meese commission would now be dangerous sexual predators....

In many repressive countries—whether in Central America, Asia, Africa, Eastern Europe, or the Middle East—there is practically no "pornography." But there is a great deal of violence against women. In the Netherlands and Scandinavia, where there are almost no restrictions on sexually explicit materials, their rate of sex-related crime is much lower than in the United States....

"Violent pornography is viewed by many as the most offensive form of expression. But it can be seen in two ways: as the depiction of consensual sadomasochism or as the depiction of actual coercion and violence against non-consenting persons. If the latter, the actual perpetrators of the violence or coercion have broken the law and should be prosecuted to its full extent.

...We believe it is possible to be feminists dedicated to equal rights and the elimination of violence against women while defending the freedom of all kinds of sexual expression.
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